

Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, December 21, 2009
3:30-5:30 p.m. – Adelbert Hall, Toepfer Room

AGENDA

3:30pm	Approval of Minutes from the November 17, 2009 Faculty Senate meeting, <i>attachment</i>	C. Musil
3:35pm	President's Announcements	B. Snyder
3:40pm	Provost's Announcements	B. Baeslack
3:45pm	Chair's Announcements	C. Musil
3:45pm	Report from the Executive Committee	A. Levine
3:55pm	Report from Secretary of the Corporation	J. Arden-Ornt
4:00pm	Changes to R Grade and Academic Standing Policies	G. Chottiner
4:25pm	University's Internationalization Efforts	D. Fleshler
4:50pm	Interim Report from <i>ad hoc</i> SAGES Review Committee	C. Covault



CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate
Minutes of the Meeting of December 21, 2009
Toepfer Room, Adelbert Hall

Members present

Keith Armitage
Bud Baeslack
Tim Beal
Jessica Berg
Christine Cano
Susan Case
Gary Chottiner
Corbin Covault
Mary Davis
Mark DeGuire
Julia Grant
Dave Hutter

Betsy Kaufman
Jim Kazura
Cheryl Killion
Ken Ledford
Alan Levine
Frank Merat
Katy Mercer
Shirley Moore
Diana Morris
Carol Musil
Dan Ornt
Joe Prah

Roy Ritzmann
Cassandra Robertson
Jonathan Sadowsky
Samantha Schartman
Benjamin Schechter
Barbara Snyder
Betsy Tracy
Susan Tullai-McGuinness
Terry Wolpaw
Liz Woyczynski
Nicholas Ziats

Members Absent

Kathryn Adams
Bruce Averbook
Cynthia Beall
Nabil Bissada
Robert Bonomo
Daniela Calvetti
Martha Cathcart
Mark Chance
Faye Gary
Angela Graves

Peter Haas
Sue Hinze
Christine Hudak
Ken Loparo
Leonard Lynn
Kalle Lyytinen
G. Regina Nixon
John Orlock
Rodney Pratt
Faisal Quereshy

Scott Shane
Mark Smith
Glenn Starkman
Sorin Teich
Michele Walsh
Shengbo Wang
Georgia Wiesner
Dave Wilson
Gary Wnek

Others Present

Dan Anker
Rick Bischoff
John Clochesy
Don Feke

David Fleshler
Marilyn Mobley
Kathy O'Linn
Dean Patterson

Tim Robson
Ginger Saha
Don Stewart

Call to Order

Professor Carol Musil, chair, Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Approval of minutes

Upon motion, duly seconded, the minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of November 17, 2009 were approved as submitted.

President's announcements

President Barbara Snyder remarked on the recent death of alum Frank Rudy, a 1950 graduate of Case Institute of Technology, who invented the Nike air-sole. Case Western Reserve was among the institutions that benefited from his generous philanthropy. She commented on the Third Frontier Awards given to Case Western Reserve researchers and the importance continuing support from the State of Ohio. She noted that the university received funding for 142 research awards, totaling 65.2 million dollars, from federal stimulus initiatives. President Snyder encouraged people to vote for Mr. Greg Debeljak for the Liberty Mutual National Coach of the Year in college football. The weblink for voting has been posted regularly on *Case Daily*. Coach Debeljak has had three undefeated seasons in a row. President Snyder thanked the faculty for their efforts on behalf of the Faculty Senate.

Provost's announcements

Provost Bud Baeslack said that the strategic alliance proposals are being evaluated; an announcement about the funded proposals will be made at the start of the spring semester. The Budget System Review Committee is in the process of meeting with the deans.

Chair's announcements

Prof. Carol Musil, chair, Faculty Senate announced that she attended the recent Graduate Student Senate retreat where student senators talked about the importance of partnering with faculty and the Faculty Senate. Prof. Stan Gerson informed Prof. Musil that he implemented many of the changes suggested by the Senate to the CTORSP program which was approved by the Faculty Senate in November. Prof. Musil and Prof. Alan Levine, chair-elect, Faculty Senate met with Prof. Katy Mercer, chair, Faculty Senate Nominating Committee to get the committee started in its work to recruit new 2010-2011 membership to the faculty senate standing committees. Prof. Susan Tullai-McGuinness will serve as the faculty senate representative to the university's Climate Action Planning Steering Committee.

Chair-elect's announcements

Prof. Alan Levine, chair-elect, Faculty Senate said that the Executive Committee approved the changes to the Academic Standing and the R grade policies which were presented by the Committee on Undergraduate Education. The Executive Committee also approved honorary degrees for Mr. Greg Mortenson and Dr. Ciro de Quadros. A faculty senate *ad hoc* committee has been formed to consider the feasibility of changes to the Faculty Handbook that would increase the importance of faculty-centric academic advising. The Executive Committee also discussed which changes in academic policies should be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for further review. Items in the General Bulletin; degree requirements; policies when multiple schools/college are involved; new degrees, including those in the professional schools; and interdisciplinary programs should be reviewed by the Faculty Senate. Policies that concern only one program; changes that affect only one major; and professional school decisions mandated by accrediting bodies do not need to be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for review. The Executive Committee also heard reports from the chairs of the following committees: Committee on Faculty Personnel, Committee on Minority Affairs, and Committee on Women Faculty.

Report of the Secretary of the Corporation

Jeanine Arden-Ornt, vice president and general counsel and secretary of the corporation, reported on the December meeting of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. Faculty appointments, room and board rates, the capital spending plan, and changes to the A and B retirement plans were approved. A financial report about projected deficits was shared. There was also a report from the Provost about academic developments, new emeriti appointments, and an annual report on Squire Valleevue Farm.

Changes to R Grade and Academic Standing Policies

Prof. Gary Chottiner, chair, Faculty Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education, presented the committee's resolution regarding the policy for R grades. The R grade indicates that the course extends over more than one semester and a final evaluative grade will be assigned when the course is complete. The R grade signifies satisfactory progress. Once the R is converted to a letter-grade, Dean's Honors or a previously-imposed academic standing action will be removed, if necessary, according to the updated GPA. Upon motion, duly seconded, the Faculty Senate voted to approve the updated R grade policy as submitted.

Prof. Chottiner, assisted by Jeff Wolcowitz, dean, Undergraduate Studies, presented the resolution from the Committee on Undergraduate Education concerning changes to the Academic Standing policies. Dean Wolcowitz said the impetus for change was to neither raise nor lower the bar but to address anomalies in the policies and create processes that are both quick and forgiving. One of the proposed changes allows students to come off academic probation sooner. Students need to improve only their most recent semester GPA, rather than their cumulative GPA, to come off academic probation. Another proposed change requires first year students to achieve at 2.0, rather than a 1.75 GPA, to remain in good academic standing. A senator expressed concern that first year students shouldn't be treated like upperclassmen. Dean Wolcowitz pointed out that first year students who achieve only a 1.75 have to get significantly better grades than a 2.0 the following year in order to meet the required minimum 2.0 GPA for second year students. Raising the bar to 2.0 will prompt earlier outreach efforts from the Office of Undergraduate Studies. Prof. Chottiner pointed out that students eligible for academic separation get a hearing and they submit a letter informing the Academic Standing Board of any contributing circumstances; academic separation is never automatic. Although the minimum GPA would increase, other policies for first year students would remain the same. They will still be allowed to complete fewer credit hours and withdraw from classes later in the semester. Increasing the minimum GPA would prevent freshman athletes with a GPA below 2.0 from participating on varsity sports teams. A motion, duly seconded, proposed postponing the vote until more information about first year students who had successfully improved their academic standing from a 1.75-1.99 GPA could be presented. The motion was defeated. Upon motion, duly seconded, the changes to the Academic Standing policies were approved as submitted.

University's Internationalization Efforts

Mr. David Fleshler, associate provost, International Affairs, described the university's upcoming internationalization efforts. The International Advisory Board has been formed; the board will help the university form a strategic plan for internationalization. Three faculty-led subcommittees will be formed shortly to address: infrastructure for the International Affairs Office, education abroad/international experience, and international student recruitment and retention. Senators asked a few questions. Mr. Fleshler commented that "internationalizing the curriculum" could be accomplished in a variety of ways yet to be determined, from adding an international perspective to individual classes or a sequence of core classes on international topics. Mr. Fleshler agreed that partnerships with other institutions, either

local or abroad, are a cost-effective way to pursue internationalization efforts. There were several comments about balancing opportunities to partner with Chinese institutions and the value of diversifying our international outreach to all parts of the world. And the university's efforts to internationalize should not come at the expense of the university's commitment to underrepresented minority students in the US. Mr. Fleshler confirmed that undergraduate and graduate students will serve on the Advisory Board and a few of the other committees.

Interim Report from *ad hoc* SAGES Review Committee

Prof. Corbin Covault, chair, Provost's and Faculty Senate *ad hoc* committee SAGES Review Committee presented the committee's interim report. The committee is still considering 1) providing different required sequences of SAGES classes and 2) the needed resources for SAGES services and staffing. He expects that the final report will be ready in February. A senator commented that departments have reduced other course offerings to meet the demands for required SAGES classes. In response to another question, Prof. Corbin noted that the reference to experiential learning in the interim report would be clarified in the committee's final report. He confirmed that while there will likely not be any forums scheduled for students or faculty to respond to the committee's final report; but the committee will likely pose questions that need more discussion. A senator asked if the quality of the SAGES program is diminished when the classes are taught by instructors rather than faculty; Prof. Corbin responded that his committee had not found that to be true. Another issue that will be addressed in the final report is academic advising for first year students; surveys indicate that students are unsatisfied with the academic advising provided under the auspices of the SAGES program. Prof. Musil thanked Prof. Corbin and his committee for their efforts and encouraged the committee's continued deliberations on the specific directives required for the committee's final report.

Adjournment

Upon motion, duly seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

APPROVED
by the
FACULTY SENATE



ELIZABETH H. WOYCZYNSKI
SECRETARY OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY

PROPOSAL TO MODIFY HOW R GRADES ARE USED FOR ACADEMIC STANDING PURPOSES

WHEREAS, the Faculty Handbook states that "The Committee on Undergraduate Education shall review and recommend to the Faculty Senate with respect to ... changes in academic requirements and regulations for undergraduate students, ... standards for undergraduate academic standing," and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education, FSCUE, has considered and endorsed the following change in policies;

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED THAT

In those courses that award grades of R at the end of the semester, indicating that the course extends over more than one semester and a final evaluative grade will be assigned when the course is complete; the R grade signifies satisfactory progress. Therefore, the hours for which the grade of R is temporarily awarded will be considered as hours successfully completed for the awarding of Dean's Honors and the determination of academic standing at the end of the semester. For the purposes of calculating GPA for Dean's Honors and academic standing actions, the grade of R will be treated in the same way as a P.

However, once the R is converted to a letter-grade, Dean's Honors will be updated on the student's transcript if the newly-completed GPA does not correspond to the Dean's Honors already listed or the student now qualifies for Dean's Honors that were not previously awarded.

Similarly, if a student no longer qualifies for a previously-imposed academic standing action once an R is converted to a letter-grade, that action will be removed from the student's record. If the conversion of an R grade occurs before another semester of enrollment has been completed, the Undergraduate Academic Standing Board will take action on the newly-completed GPA. If a student has completed a semester subsequent to the awarding of an R grade, the Undergraduate Academic Standing Board will not go back and impose an action retroactively.

GC, 11/05/2009

A detailed explanation of the following resolution, including a comparison to current policies, is provided after the resolution.

FSCUE Resolution to Modify Undergraduate Academic Standing Rules

WHEREAS, the Faculty Handbook states that "The Committee on Undergraduate Education shall review and recommend to the Faculty Senate with respect to ... changes in academic requirements and regulations for undergraduate students, ... standards for undergraduate academic standing," and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education, FSCUE, has considered and endorsed the following change in policies;

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED THAT

1. For full-time upper class students the requirements for good standing be a semester grade point average of 2.000 or higher and a minimum of 12 credit-hours earned in the immediately preceding semester. Such students who, at the end of any semester, fail to maintain the standard of performance for good standing will be placed on probation.
2. Students on academic probation who fail to return to good standing at the end of the subsequent semester will be eligible for separation for at least two academic sessions, including the summer session.
3. A student is eligible for separation without a semester of probation for either of the following reasons:
 - a. The student's semester grade point average is less than 1.000; or
 - b. The student has not earned at least 9 credit-hours in that semester.
4. First-year students should be held to the same 2.000 GPA standard as all other students. However, they should need to earn only 9 credit-hours in the first semester to maintain good standing; beginning in the second semester, they should be held to the same 12 credit-hour standard as upperclass students.
5. First-semester students should be subject to separation without already being on probation if:
 - a. The student's semester grade point average is less than 1.000; AND
 - b. The student has not earned at least 9 credit-hours in that semester.
6. New transfer students in the first semester should be treated in the same way as new first-year students.
7. A student who registers for a part-time semester should be in good standing if he or she earns a semester GPA of at least 2.000. A student who fails to meet this GPA standard should be placed on probation. Part-time students should not be eligible for separation without already being on probation, but should become eligible for separation if they fail to earn good standing for two consecutive semesters.

Proposal to Modify Academic Standing Rules

Drawing on its experience reviewing the records of students eligible for separation or permanent separation at the end of each semester, the Ad Hoc FSCUE Subcommittee on Academic Standing undertook a review of our current regulations regarding academic standing for undergraduates. The review started by identifying a number of anomalies and areas of concern in the implementation of the current regulations. The group then adopted a set of principles to guide the shape of a set of academic standing regulations for undergraduates. Based on those principles, the subcommittee outlined a proposal that would apply to the vast majority of our students, full-time students beyond the first-year, and then asked how those rules might be adjusted to deal with different sub-populations: first-year students, new transfer students, part-time students, students enrolled at CWRU for the summer term, students returning from separation, and transient students. This document summarizes those deliberations. Walking through the series of questions that guided our discussion, the proposal is shown in **boldface** in the left column and current practice is shown on the right.

Some areas of concern under our current rules

1. A student may be placed on probation or be eligible for separation at the end of the same semester for which she or he has earned dean's honors.
2. When a student is placed on probation because of insufficient hours, it is often ill-advised for the student to enroll in sufficient hours the next semester to return to good standing. In these cases, the deans often advise students to take fewer hours and tell them that it is unlikely that they will be separated if they earn at least 12 credit-hours with a GPA of 2.000 or greater.
3. The current rules present the anomaly of requiring a student to earn at least 9 credit-hours in any given semester, except the second semester of the first year.
4. Part-time semesters are hard to administer; in fact, the procedures that we have followed do not correspond to the rules as written.
5. We have never been comfortable with the treatment of summers and no specific guidelines are written down.
6. The rules are sufficiently complex that a simple computer algorithm cannot be constructed to identify the students who are eligible for academic action; also, there are often different interpretations and/or errors when different deans review the same record.
7. Students are often confused or surprised when they learn that they are eligible for academic standing review and about the way that the 24-credit-hours-across-two-semesters rule interacts with our requirement that students be in good standing to earn credit off-campus over the summer.

Some simple principles to guide the shape of academic standing rules

1. We should give students a great deal of freedom to organize their lives at the University and only intervene and limit their freedom in extreme cases.
2. When the student moves beyond the acceptable range, we should respond quickly.
3. We should be quick to move students back to good standing when they are once again performing in the acceptable range.
4. The rules should be easy for students to understand and easy to administer.
5. As a benchmark, we should expect that a full-time student arriving at the University with no transfer or AP credit can complete a degree in eight regular (fall/spring) semesters; this means that a student should be expected to be able to successfully complete 15-17 credit-hours in a semester.

Proposal for full-time upper class students

Current language and/or practice

<p>That the requirements for good standing be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. a semester grade point average of 2.000 or higher; and2. a minimum of 12 credit-hours earned in the immediately preceding semester. <p>Students who, at the end of any semester, fail to maintain the standard of performance for good standing will be placed on probation.</p>	<p>“Following the first year, the requirements for good standing for full-time students are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. a semester grade point average of 2.000 or higher <i>and</i>2. a cumulative grade point average of 2.000 or higher <i>and</i>3. a minimum of nine credit-hours earned each semester <i>and</i>4. an average of 12 credit-hours earned each semester during two consecutive semesters of full time enrollment. <p>Students who, at the end of any semester, fail to maintain the standards of performance required for good standing as specified above will be placed on probation.”</p>
<p>Students on academic probation who fail to return to good standing at the end of the subsequent semester will be eligible for separation for at least two academic sessions, including the summer session.</p>	<p>“Students on academic probation who fail to meet the standard of improvement established by the colleges will be eligible to be separated from the colleges for at least two academic sessions, including the summer session.”</p>
<p>A student is eligible for separation without a semester of probation for either of the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The student’s semester grade point average is less than 1.000; or2. The student has not earned at least 9 credit-hours in that semester.	<p>“A student is eligible for separation without a semester of probation for either of the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The student’s semester grade point average is less than 1.000.2. The student has not earned at least 19 credit hours in two consecutive semesters of full-time enrollment.”

1. Should the rules be different for first-year students? Both semesters or only the first semester?

<p>First-year students should be held to the same 2.000 GPA standard as all other students. However, they should need to earn only 9 credit-hours in the first semester to maintain good standing; beginning in the second semester, they should be held to the same 12 credit-hour standard as upperclass students.</p>	<p>“In order to maintain good academic standing, a first year undergraduate [defined as the first two semesters of enrollment for students who are beginning their college studies] must earn at Case a minimum of 9 hours and an average of 1.700 or higher in the first semester and a total of 21 hours with a cumulative average of 1.75 or higher by the end of the second semester of full-time enrollment.”</p>
---	--

1a. Should a first-semester student be subject to separation without already being on probation under any circumstances?

<p>First-semester students should be subject to separation without already being on probation if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The student’s semester grade point average is less than 1.000; AND2. The student has not earned at least 9 credit-hours in that semester.	<p>Currently, first-year students are not eligible for separation at the end of the first semester and are eligible for separation at the end of the second semester only if they were placed on probation at the end of the first semester.</p>
---	--

2. Should the rules be different for new transfer students?

New transfer students in the first semester should be treated in the same way as new first-year students.	Currently, new transfer students are subject to the rules for upperclass students.
--	--

3. How should we treat part-time semesters?

A student who registers for a part-time semester should be in good standing if he or she earns a semester GPA of at least 2.000. A student who fails to meet this GPA standard should be placed on probation. Part-time students should not be eligible for separation without already being on probation, but should become eligible for separation if they fail to earn good standing for two consecutive semesters.	“Semester and cumulative credit hour expectations for good standing will be adjusted and prorated for a matriculated student who enrolls as a part-time student. For example, a half-time student must have completed successfully one-half of the minimum number of required semester hours.” In practice, however, we do not review part-time students until they have completed sufficient semesters to total a full-time semester. They are then reviewed on the basis of a composite of those semesters.
---	--

3a. Should a student who went on probation as a full-time student be able to return to good standing as a part-time student?

A full-time student placed on probation who subsequently enrolls as a part-time student should not be reviewed for further academic action until she or he has completed sufficient semesters to total at least 12 attempted credit-hours. At that time, the student should be reviewed on the basis of a composite of those semesters.	As above, currently, students who enroll as part-time students are not reviewed until they have completed sufficient semesters to total a full-time semester and are then reviewed on the basis of a composite of those semesters.
Similarly, a student who goes on probation as a part-time student should not be reviewed for further academic action until she or he has completed sufficient semesters to total at least the number of credit-hours attempted in the semester for which the student was placed on probation. At that time, the student should be reviewed on the basis of a composite of those semesters and should be expected to have earned at least the number of credit-hours attempted in the semester for which she or he was placed on probation.	Ditto.

4. How should we treat summers?

<p>Students should not be reviewed for academic action at the end of the summer term except in the following two situations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A student on probation as of the end of the spring semester should be returned to good standing at the end of the summer term if she or he has completed at least 6 credit-hours at CWRU with a summer GPA of at least 2.000.2. Nursing students who enroll for a full course load (at least 12 credit-hours) that includes the capstone course during the summer term should be reviewed according to the standards of a regular fall or spring semester.	<p>Currently, we have nothing written down about how we deal with summers. However, our practice has been to review only the records of students already on probation who complete at least 6 credit-hours during the summer session. At that time, we look at a composite of the spring and summer as a new semester following the spring and the student is either returned to good standing or eligible for separation.</p>
--	--

5. Should the path to permanent separation following readmission be the same as above or should a single failure to meet the requirements for good standing make one eligible for permanent separation?

<p>A student who has been readmitted from separation should be held to the same academic standards as outlined above (e.g. a full-time student who earns fewer than 12 credit-hours with 2.000>GPA≥1.000 should be placed on probation). A second separation under the above standards should be permanent.</p>	<p>“Students being readmitted after being separated must thereafter maintain good academic standing. A readmitted student who performs below the level required for good standing will be eligible for permanent separation from the University.”</p>
---	---

6. How should we think about the continuation of transient student status in light of these academic standing regulations?

<p>Transient students should be expected to perform at the same academic standards as our degree-candidates. In particular, transient students whose records would make them eligible for separation as degree-candidates should not be allowed to continue as transient students unless they successfully petition the FSCUE Subcommittee on Academic Standing.</p>	<p>“The privilege of enrolling as a visiting student for more than one semester is subject to the following limitations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">A minimum grade point average of “C” must be maintained.All visiting students are limited to a maximum of 30 semester hours as visiting students and may not register in more than five semesters, summer session included.” (Application for Enrollment)
---	---

7. How should a student's academic status at their home institution affect our acceptance of them as a transient student?

<p>A degree-candidate from another institution should only be allowed to enroll as a transient student at CWRU if the student would be eligible to enroll for that semester at his or her home institution. Exceptions may be granted by appeal to the FSCUE Subcommittee on Academic Standing.</p>	<p>“Before enrollment, the transient student must present a statement of good standing from the registrar of his or her home college.” (General Bulletin)</p>
--	---

Proposal approved by the Ad Hoc FSCUE Subcommittee on Academic Standing, 9/30/2009

Ad Hoc SAGES Review Committee

Interim Report
November 11, 2009

The Ad Hoc committee on SAGES is engaged in a review of the documentation of the planning, implementation, and oversight of the SAGES. The Committee believes that the SAGES program as a whole is in alignment with the University's plans and aspirations as articulated in the University Strategic Plan (Forward Thinking). Specifically, SAGES addresses the University's core values of Academic Excellence and Inclusiveness and Diversity through a distinctive experience of small, writing-intensive seminars designed to engage student learners. SAGES seminars represent students' first introduction to the University and to the practice of experiential education, where they are encouraged to develop their own questions, research strategies, and solutions to contemporary problems.

In our opinion, SAGES should become a high priority within the University community. Given the demands on the attention of the leadership and constraints on resources, SAGES is at risk of being weakened in relationship to other priorities that the University is now embarking upon. Actions by the leadership of the University and its faculty should be taken and resources should be allocated so that any shortcomings of the program – real or perceived – are addressed efficiently and comprehensively.

We summarize our progress towards addressing the charges to the committee (See Appendix A)

- **Goals of SAGES:** A sub-task group was formed to articulate and explicitly document the goals of the SAGES program as inferred from various historical reports and other program materials. These goals fall into two primary categories: (1) Education Goals that provide a direct benefit to students; and (2) Institutional Goals that further the strategic aims of the University. Appendix B lists these goals. The committee is further considering the question of the relative priority of these goals and the extent to which different components of the SAGES are effective at meeting them.
- **Current Structure of SAGES:** We do not anticipate recommending major changes to the primary components of SAGES at this time. We are considering the extent to which some alternatives might be established to provide greater flexibility without substantially compromising on the core educational values of SAGES. Work on this charge is ongoing.
- **Pedagogy of SAGES:** Work on this charge is ongoing.
- **Value-Added by SAGES:** The Committee has reviewed the report of the Writing Portfolio Committee, which suggests that students are improving their writing abilities as a direct result of their first three SAGES seminars. This provides an important measure of the value added to the Case undergraduate curriculum. Work on this charge is ongoing.
- **Advising:** A sub-task group has prepared a report on the first-year advising component of SAGES and we have reviewed the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising. There is some mix of opinion within our committee as to whether or not these recommendations also represent the best way to support the goals of SAGES. Work on this charge is ongoing.
- **Resource Issues:** We have considered a number of issues related to resource allocation, not only in terms of financial support but also contributions of faculty time and talent. In particular we are considering various issues related to SAGES course staffing, teaching loads on departments, and the overall need to attract and retain the most talented instructors for SAGES courses. These topics represent particularly thorny issues. Work on this charge is ongoing.

Appendix A: Charge to the Ad Hoc Committee on SAGES:

1. Review the goals for SAGES as defined in the Phase I and Phase II SAGES Task Force reports and discussions leading up to and following the adoption of both the SAGES pilot and full SAGES implementation. Clarify and suggest improvements to those goals if and as necessary.
2. Assess the effectiveness of the current structure for SAGES (i.e., a First Seminar, two University seminars, a Department Seminar, and a SAGES Capstone) in meeting those goals. Determine if and how this effectiveness can be improved. Examine the relative merits – pedagogical, logistical, financial and reputational -- of establishing alternative tracks within or outside SAGES for meeting the goals.
3. Review the pedagogy and range of delivery modes used with the various SAGES components to ensure that students are being well-served.
4. Evaluate to the extent possible the “value-added” by the SAGES program to the student experience in comparison to traditional modes of meeting general education requirements. Determine if and how to increase this added value and students’ perception of it.
5. Determine whether the student advising expected of First Seminar instructors is effective, and how it could be improved.
6. Assess whether the logistical parameters, staffing and other resources (e.g., number of students per seminar, availability of writing instructors, utilization of tenured or tenure-track faculty) associated with SAGES are appropriate for sustaining the program and its pedagogy. Determine how they should be adjusted to optimize the program and its attractiveness to prospective students within realistic current and future resource constraints.

Appendix B: Draft Educational and Institutional Goals of SAGES:

<p><u>Educational goals</u></p>	<p><u>Institutional goals (overall)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Facilitate faculty/student interaction 2. Improved student mentoring 3. Provide a common educational experience 4. <i>Provide a distinctive educational experience</i> 5. <i>Marketing of a distinctive product</i>
<p><u>First seminar goals</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhance basic intellectual skills of academic inquiry: critical reading, quantitative and qualitative analysis, written and oral communication 2. Introduce basic information literacy skills 3. Provide a foundation for ethical decision making 	<p><u>First seminar goals</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encourage a global, multidisciplinary perspective on the learning process 2. Provide a supportive intellectually-based common freshman experience 3. Facilitate faculty/student interaction
<p><u>University Seminars</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continued growth of academic inquiry skills introduced in the FS: critical reading, quantitative and qualitative analysis, written and oral communication with ample opportunity for revision 2. Provide experience in integration and synthesis of theories, information, and methods of inquiry across subsets of disciplines 3. Continued experiences addressing issues in the evaluation and use of information, in ethical decision making, and in appreciation of the importance of cultural diversity 	<p><u>University Seminars</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide additional close faculty/student interaction through small class sizes in a seminar format

<p><u>Departmental Seminar Goals</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refine skills related to communication <u>within the discipline</u> including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reading critically o Writing clearly o Citing appropriately o And speaking effectively. 2. Apply discipline-based ethics. 	<p><u>Departmental Seminar Goals</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Engage students with department faculty</i>
<p><u>Capstone Goals</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Define a problem (or creative endeavor),</u> critically research background material and communicate an effective response to the problem or project for the endeavor. 2. Publically present the response or project in an archival format subject to a <i>rigorous</i> evaluation within the discipline <u>and will typically include written and spoken components</u> 	<p><u>Capstone Goals</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Promote an attitude of success in our students</i> 2. <i>Promote the value of writing and oral communications in professional success</i> 3. <i>Recognize and celebrate the accomplishments of our undergraduates</i>