

TMCC Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Academic Calendar Committee
Initial meeting, W Dec. 2, 2009 2 – 3 p.m. VSTA 111

Minutes

Brad Summerhill and Joe Gonzalez, Co-chairs

Membership: Steve Schenk[not present], Carola Naumer, Kat Leishman, Beth Baines, Paul Davis, Terry Hallet, [late], Melanie Lawler, Maria Arigotti[not present], Jeff Wallace[not present], Sharon Lowe, Colette Morey, Lee Schaffer

The reasons for the agenda and minutes, is to have transparency to the Faculty Senate.

Agenda

I. Review of the committee's charge (Brad and Joe)

- a. To look at the academic calendar, and see if a finals week is viable with all the other happenings on campus. If NSHE code comes into play. If committee members want to have an agenda item added, they can contact the Co-Chairs. Agenda approval should be set before Minutes approval.
- b. Discussion: Is there a finals week at other campuses? Community Colleges typically don't follow a finals week. TMCC may be an exception, uncertain.
- c. Decision: Next Agenda- Finals week locally, regionally and nationally; how it is performed, if it exists.

II. Groupwise Shared Folder "Academic Calendar" (Brad)

- ✓ you should have received a notification on this
- everyone has full access to read and add, so be aware that all documents and emails will be available for viewing/reading to the full committee
- all emails Brad sends/receives relevant to the committee will be placed in this folder for transparency and convenience
- a. Reason for it is convenience and transparency. Everyone could share important information with the others on the committee.
Decision: Lee needs to be invited to be a part of the calendar.

II. Faculty survey review (Brad)

- a. Half of faculty took the survey. Most faculty don't seem to care, but many people don't seem to understand what the process involves. It is more than naming the last week finals week. Three departments were most responsive. English, Biology, and Math. English department was equally divided. Biology was slightly favoring the idea, and ten out of thirteen professors in the math department wanted a finals week.
- b. No one will be forced to give a final exam.

III. Student survey progress report (Joe)

- a. Discussion: Logistical issues: Develop a vehicle that can be distributed, but it can't be distributed to the whole student body. It will need to be targeted, so developing the questions will take time. What students will have the most pertinent information? Full time students, in their second year at the school, or 18+ or 30+ credits. Joe can bring a sample survey at the spring meeting.
- b. Discussion: How would "Finals week" be defined? What does it mean for online students? For night-time students, versus daytime students? Perhaps proctoring for online students.

V. Spring schedule and timeline (Everyone)

- we need to schedule three spring meetings (February, March and April)
- come to a general agreement on how to proceed
- goal: to produce a written recommendation for Faculty Senate's May meeting
 - majority and minority reports are a possibility
 - a. Discussion: Pat Slaven and a representative from PIO would be very helpful to the Committee. Jess Careone, perhaps Kyle Dalpe? Who develops the calendar, and who approves it? Should it be done, before how to be done. Ted Lambert could argue for a Finals week. Jeff Wallace could argue against a Finals week.
 - b. Decisions: Deans should be involved in the discussion, or perhaps questioned about their opinions of the committee's charge. Email first, and if an invitation is appropriate, it should be sent. Controller's Office; Earl Aulston, and financial aid; John Gualtne, should be notified. All departmental chairs should be notified. Speakers should be told of time limits.
 - c. Research on impact of Finals week on community colleges
 - d. Decision for dates: February 23, 2:00 PM. March 23, 2:00 PM, April 20, 2:00 PM.

VI. New Business

- a. No new business.