First Year Experience Committee
2011-2012 Final Committee Report

Committee Members:

Luci Moreira, Chair (Hispanic Studies)
Sofia Agrest (Mathematics)
Maureen Hays (Sociology and Anthropology)
Adam Mendelsohn (Jewish Studies)
Tammy Ingram (History)
Yiorgos Vassilanonakis (Music)

Susan Kattwinkel (FYE Director, Fall semester, non-voting)
Christopher Korey, FYE Director, Spring semester, non-voting (Biology)
Kay Smith (AE, non-voting)
Mindy Miley (New Student Programs, non-voting)
Jeri Cabot (Student Affairs, non-voting)
Page Keller non-voting

The FYE experience committee met 9 times during the academic year. Not all members participated in all discussions due to time conflicts. The committee discussed several issues by email as well.

The 2011-2012 was a transitional period. Susan Kattwinkel, who had been the First Year Program for several years resigned and Chris Korey, a 2010-2011 committee member was selected to be the new Director. During the fall 2011 Susan Kattwinkel was the Director, and Chris Korey took the directorship position in January.

This year the FYE Committee considered the following issues:
1. We reviewed and approved First Year Seminar and Learning Community Proposals for 2012-2013 (This took place in the fall).
2. We discussed several specific issues by email (fall and spring)
3. We examined the feedback sent by the 2011-2012 FYE faculty who participated in the spring 2011 workshop and made changes for the 2012 workshop.
4. We reviewed and approved new forms for faculty proposals (courses, major event grant, mini grant, travel grant)
5. We reviewed and updated the FYE committee composition and duties, which were submitted to Lynn Cherry, faculty speaker, and then to the By-Laws Committee.

APPENDICES:
1. Informal agendas for each meeting can be found in Appendix 1.
2. Forms for faculty (FYE courses, FYE faculty course campus event grant application, FYE faculty course travel grant application, and FYE faculty mini
grant application), cf. Appendix 2

3. Document sent to the faculty speaker with regards to the composition and duties of the FYE committee, cf. Appendix 3

APPENDIX 1 – AGENDA FOR MEETINGS
The following items were discussed by email
1. Changes in the Business/Theater learning community proposal for the summer 2011, which would be offered in the spring 2012 (8/18-23)
2. FYE waivers (10/05)
3. New FYSM proposal (11/03)
4. Options for FYE students who withdraw and need another class (11/10)
5. Straggling proposal (12/01)

First Year Experience Committee
April 28, 2011

Agenda:
• Select a new chair for the 2011-2012 year

First Year Experience Committee
October 11, 2011
Local: Randolph Hall, conference room 106D

Agenda:
• Discussion on proposals on Oaks
When you read the proposals, keep in mind the following:
a) Is the proposal appropriate for FYE students?
b) Is there anything else that you expected to see in that proposal and it is not?

First Year Experience Committee
October 14, 2011
Local: NSP meeting room

Agenda:
• Discussion on proposals on Oaks
When you read the proposals, keep in mind the following:
a) Is the proposal appropriate for FYE students?
b) Is there anything else that you expected to see in that proposal and it is not?

First Year Experience Committee
November 29, 2011
Local: NSP Conference room

**Agenda**
- FYE Courses 2011-12
- Straggling FYE proposals
- Update on Numbers

---

**First Year Experience Committee**
January 12
Meeting with the new Director and the Chair of the committee
NSP building- Director’s office

**Agenda:**
Review of the FYE proposal form and discuss on how faculty apply for FYE funds for local or more distant outside of class experiences.

---

**First Year Experience Committee**
February 13, 2012
Local: New Science Center, Room 100
(a new non-voting member was included: Page Keller, CEPE director)

**Agenda:**
Redesigning the proposal process

- Course Proposals and how to streamline returning versus new courses
- FYSMs and their status as special topics courses and how often they can be repeated

---

**First Year Experience Committee**
February 27, 2012
Local: NSP Conference room

**Agenda**
- Lynn Cherry’s request: update on FYE committee
- Discussion on how the funds are dispersed for FYE events and activities, and how to review the requests.

---

**First Year Experience Committee**
March 13, 2012
Local: NSP Conference room
Agenda

• Consequences for students who do not complete the FYE requirement in the first academic year.
• Review of versions of the three FYE grant applications
• FYE statistics of students who are not taking any FYE course

________________________________________

First Year Experience Committee
March 19, 2012
Local: NSP Conference room

Agenda

• Last year's workshop agenda & new agenda
• Last year's workshop evaluations

________________________________________

APPENDIX 2
2012 FORMS
1. FYE teaching proposal application
2. FYE Faculty major event travel grant application
3. FYE Faculty major Travel grant
4. FYE Faculty mini grant application

________________________________________

APPENDIX 3
UPDATE INFORMATION ON THE FYE COMMITTEE
(Lynn Cherry, faculty speaker, requested the committee to review the FYE committee composition and duties. The information below is a result of discussion with the committee and it was submitted to the By-Laws Committee –cf. the BLC’s response)

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE
Chair: Luci Moreira
Academic year 2011-2012

Current Members:
Sofia Agreste (Mathematics, Maureen Hays (Sociology/Anthropology), Tammy L. Ingram (History); Yiorgos Vassilandonakis (Music), Adam D. Mendelsohn (Jewish studies), and Luci Moreira (Hispanic Studies). Ex-officio non-voting members:
Christopher A Korey (Director), Melinda Miley, Jeri O. Cabot, Kay Smith, and Page Keller.

1. Title
1.1. Does the title of your committee accurately reflect the work and/or focus of the work you do? Yes, the First Year Experience reviews faculty’s proposals, discusses types of classes for freshman students and other issues related to students, in order to ensure that the College “assist new students with their transition to college and provide them with skills that will help them succeed throughout their academic careers”.

1.2. Committee composition
1.2.1. Is the composition of your committee too small or too large to effectively fulfill your charge?
The composition is just right (seven members). This year, for some reason, we are only six members with several areas represented.

1.2.2. If the composition of your committee specifies that a certain number of members must be faculty senators, do you believe this is appropriate/ necessary now that we have a smaller senate?
There is no requirement of faculty senators in this committee.

1.2.3. Is there a need for representation from specific areas, schools or divisions of the College? If so, does the current composition of the committee reflect this need?
Yes, there is a need. It is fairly represented but the School of Business is not represented this year.

1.2.4. Are the appropriate staff/administrative representatives included in the composition of your committee (usually these are ex-officio members)?
Yes. We added the Director of the Center for Excellence in Peer Education (CEPE) as an ex-officio member. This staff/administrative representative was not included in the original composition of the committee because the position was created after the creation of the committee.

The original description stated in the FAM also mentions a student who should be appointed by the SGA. From conversation with other committee members, there has not been a student appointed in past years. We are suggesting that the Director of the CEPE appoints one ‘peer facilitator’ to represent the student body. This will give more flexibility and ensure that there will be one student in the committee

2. Duties
2.1. Are the duties as outlined in the By-Laws consistent with the work done by your committee?
Yes.
“(1) In consultation with the relevant administrators, to support and advise the First-Year Experience program on all matters relevant to the program, including program development, budget requests, and other issues germane to program support;
(2) In consultation with the Director of the First Year Experience program, to review and assess the First-Year Experience program and to make non-binding recommendations for revisions to the program;
(3) To request and review proposals for First-Year Experience courses (sections of FYSM 101 and Learning Communities); and
(4) To assist the Director of the First-Year Experience program in recruiting students for First-Year Experience courses and to recruit and plan the training for new First-Year Experience faculty and peer facilitator.

2.2. If the work of your committee has changed/evolved over time, do these changes need to be reflected in the By-Laws?
Not at this point

2.3. Has the work of your committee changed/evolved so much that we need to rethink or re-envision the committee?
Not at this point. We have added one member (CEPE)

2.4. Does the work of your committee significantly overlap the work of other committees in such a way that we may need to merge committees so they operate more efficiently?
No, it does not.

2.5. Is there sufficient work for your committee that it should continue?
Yes, this committee is of utmost importance because it deals with freshman, their well-being, transition from High School to college, and their retention, and “beginning in Fall 2011, the First-Year Experience is required for all students entering the college.”

2.6. Should some committees have members serve for two year terms rather than the current one year terms to better ensure continuity from year to year? If so, would your committee be one that would benefit from this?
Yes, I have answered this elsewhere. It is always a good transition to have more experienced members with new ones.

3. Other
3.1. Should some committees have members serve for two year terms rather than the current one year terms to better ensure continuity from year to year? If so, would your committee be one that would benefit from this?
Yes, it is very important that in the composition of the committee some should have served for at least one year. To include this as a ‘requirement’ will not attract any faculty. The two-year length should be recommended/suggested, not required. When the Nominations Committee is nominating committee members for a given academic year, this should be taken into consideration.
Also, have at least three members who have already taught in the First-Year Experience program.

Recommendation:
1. Inclusion of a student (peer facilitator) nominated by the Director of the Center for Excellence in Peer Education (*do we need to submit this change to the Faculty Senate?*)

2. Nominate at least one member from each school.

3. Try to balance new members who have never served with members who have already served in the past year(s).

Submitted on March 5, 2012

*Luci Moreira, chair*

**BY-LAWS COMMITTEE’s RESPONSE**

The By-Laws Committee discussed your report and recommendations at our meeting on March 16. We decided not to present any motions to the Senate concerning the composition of your committee at this time, but we’re happy to discuss your recommendations with you if you like — our next meeting is scheduled for next Friday, 3/20, at 2:00.

Regarding the addition of the Director of CEPE: if the Director has been attending meetings and providing information to the committee, there’s no reason she shouldn’t continue to do so. But when we looked at the composition of the committee, we saw that this addition would give the committee five ex officio members, which to us seems like a lot for a faculty committee, even though the non-faculty ex officio members do not vote. In practice, there’s not much difference between a guest and a non-voting member of a committee, so perhaps this doesn’t make a lot of difference, but we were reluctant to officially add another non-faculty member to a faculty committee in this case. Again, we’re happy to talk with you further about this.

Regarding the student member, Lynn Cherry is trying to reach an understanding with SGA about student appointees to faculty committees. Our committee would rather have student representatives appointed by student government than have them appointed by committee members; the problem at the moment is that SGA isn’t appointing students to committees, apparently. So we’re hoping that Lynn, Susan Payment, and SGA can work something out. In the meantime, we don’t want to go forward with another method of appointing students to committees.

We concur with your recommendations that the Nominations Committee nominate at least one member from each school and that they try to balance membership between those who have never served and those who have recently served. But these aren’t recommendations we can turn into By-Laws amendments: the first (one member from each school) is already stated as a preference in the By-Laws, and the second is more a recommendation to Nominations than it is something we can legislate. From what I’ve heard, Nominations does its best to accomplish both of these goals but they are limited by faculty members’ willingness to volunteer.
So that’s my report. I certainly don’t mean it to shut the door on your recommendations, but for now we decided not to turn them into By-Laws amendments.

Submitted by Luci Moreira on April 26, 2012