Minutes Faculty Senate Meeting 12/14/18

Call to order at 12:46

Ally document conversion service for Blackboard (Linda Feeney)

This is a proposal for purchase that will go through program review. Some students may believe that they do not need accommodations. Other students have not been diagnosed. Other students who do not need accommodation may also benefit from it. As of now, Blackboard does not allow for file conversion. Ally can convert files into accessible alternate forms automatically. Institutional reporting is available. Other advantages exist. Ally integrates with Blackboard and is LMS agnostic, but files are stored separately. Videos, files created by Blackboard and many other types of files cannot be converted. It does not currently convert students' work, but will likely be able to do that soon. (See Powerpoint presentation for more details.)

Q: Does PowerPoint get converted?
A: If it has video, then it does not. Other files will be converted.
Q: What would be expected by faculty?
A: You would want to review the files that are converted to look for mistakes that need correction.
   -    That seems like it would take a lot of time. What are the statistics on error rate for conversion?
A: Around 70-80% but I expect this to improve, which is why you will have to check it. This is an estimate.
Q: Is Atlantic Cape using it because of their law suit?
A: Yes.

This costs $32000 per year.

Q: What budget does this come from?
A: Most likely Academic Affairs.
Q: What about image files? Will they be converted?
A: It will try.
Q: What if I do a course copy? Will it apply corrections?
A: I will check on that.
Comment: I am an adjunct at ACC that uses this and I am a big fan. We are one of the few colleges that were not included in the recent law suit related to accessibility.
Q: How does it handle tables, graphs, mathematical equations?
A: That will depend.
Q: Will there be technology Bootcamps to help faculty use this?
A: Yes.
Q: Is there a trial period?
A: No.
Q: Is it an annual contract?
A: Yes.
Q: Could you send us some of the links to check it out?
A: Yes

Acceptance of minutes from November meeting

No questions or comments. Minutes approved from November meeting.

Literary and American Studies (second reading)

Three recommendations were made at the last meeting. Consistent with those suggestions, we changed the minimum GPA to 3.2 in LITT courses, included learning outcomes for BA in LITT and MA in American studies, and included an assessment plan for 4-1 program.

Q: How many students are currently in the MA?
A: 13
Q: Is the intention that this will recruit more students?
A: That is the hope.
Q: Any estimates on how many more?
A: We hope for it to go up to 20. A lot of our students are part time. It is 30 credits total. This is designed for students who start in the BA program and want to fast-track through the MA program.
Q: Are there additional resources needed for this?
A: No.
Q: When students take grad courses as undergrads, is there a limit to the number they can take?
A: The current policies are 2 courses. Page 1 and 2 of the proposal include a summary of how the program works. The big change is that some of the seniors' courses will count toward the graduate program. (See proposal for details.)
Q: Are there other accelerated programs at Stockton?
A: Yes
Q: How does the University count this for tuition?
A: Undergrads are changed $100 per credit for graduate courses in addition to flat-rate tuition.

Vote: Passes 27-2

Minor in Sustainability (second reading)

We addressed a lot of the questions last time and no suggested changes were made. Any remaining questions?

No questions.

Vote: Passes unanimously.

Review of Faculty Assembly on Shared Governance

The Senate Executive Committee is presenting a motion given discussion at the Faculty Assembly meeting yesterday. One of the things that came out of that meeting was that shared governance does not work when we are rushed. This motion is motivated by that shared conclusion. This motion is to push the date of closer of the Strategic Plan to December 2019.

C: Do we need to adjust other dates as well?
- We could change other dates, moving them back as well.

- Should we include other working timelines in this document?

Motion to include specific language in this document to change the dates of the first and second readings.
- It seems like we should set them for March or April and May, then we can have the summer retreat for discussion.
- Why would we constrict ourselves to any date?
- Just to be sure of the dates.

More support for this motion is expressed.

Are there any harmful ramifications to postponing as this proposes?
- That is for the broader implications, not this motion.

Suggestion that we propose a projected end point.
- I recommend the Fall Faculty Conference as the time for final discussion as faculty.
- I think we should change wording from "refuse" to "reject."
- Do we need to make it December 2019? Why not fall 2019?
- December 2019 seems in keeping with Stockton's practices.
- The second reading is when we would vote on this as a faculty senate. We could then have a presentation at the fall faculty conference.

Administrator: Our current strategic plan is over, so delaying would be difficult. I would suggest changing the language to fall from December. It is also problematic because accreditation reviews like strategic plans to be in place more than a year prior to review so that it can actually be in place.

- One thing that has come up is the feeling of being pressured. Is it not possible to just say that administrators can present the document to the board of trustees at any time?
- I recommend December rather than fall because the Senate does not meet between the May retreat and the fall faculty conference. So there would be no opportunity for deliberation between.
- People can deliberate during the summer months.
- I feel like this has moved forward in an open format and inaction could be problematic. I think expecting faculty to review it over the summer is reasonable.

Vote on changes to the document: Passes 32-1

Discussion:
- Expression of support by several members.

Vote to endorse the motion: Passes 27-2

Motion to adjourn

Meeting ends at 2:08