



## University Senate Agenda

### October 2021 Meeting

TO: Members of the University Senate

FROM: Cristina Oancea, University Senate Chair, 2021-2022

SUBJECT: October 7 University Senate Meeting


DATE: September 29, 2021

The October 2021 meeting of the University Senate will be held on Thursday, October 7, 2021, from 3:30-5pm via Zoom. Voting members should use the personalized link they were sent last time to join the webinar as a panelist. As a reminder, this link will be emailed again the day before our meeting. Please check your clutter/junk/spam folder if you do not see the invitation in your inbox. A public link for visitors is posted on the Senate website and in the University Letter.

#### I. Call to Order (Chair Cristina Oancea)

#### II. Senate Calendar:

- 1) Announcements/Chair opening remarks:
  - a. Reminder of goals (Chair Cristina Oancea)
    - i. Continue the commitment to shared governance at UND
    - ii. Support each other through the ongoing pandemic
    - iii. Encourage collaboration for greater initiatives and eco-friendly sustainability
  - b. Introduction of Provost Eric Link (Chair Cristina Oancea, Provost Eric Link)
  - c. Congratulations to the winners of last month's senate election:
    - i. University Senate Vice-Chair/Chair Elect: **Robert (Bob) Newman**
    - ii. Faculty representative on the Senate Executive Committee (SEC): **Deborah Worley**
    - iii. Staff representative on the SEC: **Brian Schill**
    - iv. Student representative on the SEC: **Kaelan Reedy**
    - v. Two new members on the Senate Committee on Committees: **Sandra Moritz and Rhoda Owens**
  - d. Reminder regarding Senate Committees' report deadlines:
    - i. Due Sept. 23<sup>rd</sup> (overdue): Committee on Committees, Compensation, Faculty Instructional Development, and University Assessment
    - ii. Due Oct. 21<sup>st</sup>: Essential Studies, Honorary Degrees, Standing Committee on Faculty Rights
  - e. Bookstore update (Jed Shivers, Matthew Breaux)

- 
- f. Pearson relationship/program (Jeff Holm)
  - g. Council of College Faculties update (Richard Millsbaugh)
  - h. Staff Senate update (Brian Schill)
  - i. Student Government update (Kaelan Reedy)
  - j. Updates from the Provost (Eric Link)
- 2) Establish Quorum (Secretary Scott Correll)
  - 3) Review and approval of Sept. 2, 2021 minutes (see attached USenate minutes)
  - 4) Senate Executive Committee report (Chair Cristina Oancea)
    - a. Faculty Instructional Development Committee (FIDC) Whitepaper/Report (see attached) – this report was submitted to the SEC for review in the Spring. The SEC discussed this report and shared it with Provost Link this summer. We wanted to also make it available to the full Senate. (Matthew Gilmore)
    - b. The SEC is working on 2 new committee proposals:
      - i. University Senate Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)
      - ii. University Senate Campus Safety Committee (CSC)
    - c. The NDUS is adopting an ePerformance evaluation program. While this program was initially intended for staff evaluations, it is also available for campuses to adopt for their faculty evaluations. Each NDUS institution is being allowed to decide if the program will be required for faculty evaluations. Feedback is currently being sought from the members representing UND on this committee. We will continue to monitor.
  - 5) Question period

### **III. Consent Calendar:**

- 6) Annual Honors Committee Report (see attached)
- 7) The SEC approved two candidates for early graduation

### **IV. Business Calendar:**

- 8) No items for this month

### **V. Matters arising**

### **VI. Adjourn**

Minutes of the University Senate Meeting  
September 2, 2021

1.

The September meeting of the University Senate was held at 3:30 p.m. on Thursday, September 2, 2021, via Zoom Conference. Past Chair Liz Legerski opened the meeting and Chair Cristina Oancea presided.

2.

The following members of the Senate were present:

Armacost, Andy	Jordan, Rachel	Oliver, Emily
Brandt, Sonja	Juntunen, Cindy	Pedersen, Daphne
Chu, Qianli	Kalbfleish, Pamela	Petros, Tom
Clark, Travis	Karikari, Isaac	Redvers, Nicole
Correll, Scott	Kehn, Andre	Reedy, Kaelan
Cox, Paula	Kraus, Robert	Reissig, Brad
Dauphinais, Kirsten	Laguetta, Soizik	Rozelle-Stone, Rebecca
Dorafshan, Sattar	Legerski, Liz	Rundquist, Brad
Doze, Van	Liang, Lewis	Schill, Brian
Dutchak, Dawson	Light, Steven	Schlenker, Jared
Gjellstad, Melissa	Lim, Howe	Shea, Heather
Hammond, Sean	Liu, Jun	Shivers, Jed
Helleloid, Duane	Mamaghani, Iraj	Spaeth, Andria
Henley, Amy	Matz, Adam	VanLooy, Jeffrey
Henneman, Emily	McGinniss, Michael	Wahl, Faith
Homstad, Stephanie	Milavetz, Barry	Walker, Stephanie
Hume, Wendelin	Munski, Douglas	Wilson, Nick
Iseminger, Colt	Myers, Brad	Wise, Richard
Jedlicka, Janet	Newman, Robert	Worley, Deborah
Jendrysik, Mark	Nonte, Stephen	Xiao, Feng
Johnson, Erika	Oancea, Cristina	Zerr, Ryan

3.

The following members of the Senate were absent:

Adjekum, Daniel	Kitzes, Adam	Mihelich, John
Borowicz, Taylor	Korsmo, Danielle	Orvedal, Casey
Chew, Jack	Kostrzewski, Diana	Perkins, Dexter
Denny, Dawn	Lian, Gracie	Peterson, Karen
Halcrow, Steven	Linder, Meloney	Sheridan, William
Halgren, Cara	Link, Eric	Tande, Brian
Hufford, Jordan	Menard, Dominique	Weber, Bret

4.

Ms. Oancea thanked everyone for voting for her. Ms. Oancea introduced herself and introduced President Armacost. President Armacost welcomed everyone back on campus. President Armacost discuss the vibrancy on campus, the opening of the Memorial Union, and the continued construction. He also discussed his guiding principles for continued growth. Following the welcome, Ms. Oancea covered the University Senate rules and procedures as well as parliamentary procedure.

5.

Ms. Oancea made comments on the coming year - continuing commitment to shared governance, supporting each other through the ongoing pandemic, and encouraging collaboration for greater initiatives and eco-friendly sustainability.

6.

Mr. Millspaugh provided an update from the Council of College Faculties. The CCF has not met since the last senate meeting. They will meet next week. There are some concerns about free speech bill as well as the challenge bill.

7.

Mr. Schill updated the Senate on the status of Staff Senate. Mr. Schill discussed the health resolution. The health resolution did not pass by majority. The state staff senate is exploring tuition waivers across the NDUS system. Mr. Schill stated that staff senate is looking at restarting the staff development program. Mr. Schill said the staff senate is looking to create an Angel fund.

8.

Mr. Reedy updated the Senate on the status of Student Senate. Mr. Reedy stated that student government is working on lots of issues, but they are focusing on experiential learning and increasing high impact practices.

9.

Mr. Holm provided the Provost updates. Mr. Link could not attend today. Mr. Link has met with the Senate Executive Committee. Mr. Link is a proponent and very much into shared governance stated Mr. Holm. Mr. Holm stated Mr. Link will take feedback from anyone on campus.

10.

Quorum was established

11.

Without objection, the minutes from the University Senate on May 6, 2021, were approved without objection.

12.

The following announcements were made:

- a. Ms. Oancea, SEC Updates
  - Summer graduation candidates were approved.
- b. Ms. Oancea, SEC Updates
  - Approved changes to faculty handbook related to HB 1503.
- c. Ms. Oancea, SEC Updates
  - Approved COI in Research Interim Policy.
- d. Ms. Oancea, SEC Updates
  - Approved English 110/130 transfer agreement with NDSU.

13.

The twenty minute question period opened at 4:00pm. Mr. Jendrysik ask why the fighting hawk statue was removed. President Armacost stated that is was removed to preserve the statue. The statue will be reinstalled inside the Memorial Union. Mr. Iseminger asked why the bookstore was having issues again. Ms. Oancea will look into it. Mr. Shivers stated that he was unaware of these issues. Mr. Shivers will follow up. Mr. Brandt stated that more students are using the bookstore to purchase their books. Mr. Hammond asked why the bookstore only orders 60% of the class capacity. Mr. Shivers stated that this may be a practice of Follett. Mr. Munski stated that 60% is a national standard as some students do not buy books and some students purchase from other sources.

14.

Ms. Oancea called attention to the Faculty Handbook updates. Without objection, the updates were accepted and filed.

15.

Ms. Oancea called attention to the ENGL 110/130 transfer agreement with NDSU. Without objection, the agreement was accepted and filed.

16.

Ms. Oancea called attention to the University Curriculum Committee Report. Without objection, the report was accepted and filed.

17.

Ms. Oancea called attention to the ballots for Senate Vice Chair/Chair Elect, faculty representative on the Senate Executive Committee, two faculty members on the Committee on Committees, staff representative to the Senate Executive Committee, student representative to the Senate Executive Committee. The election results are as follows:

Ms. Gjellstad moved to allow Ms. Legerski to work on the ballot in Qualtrics and send out with a 24-hour response time and Ms. Walker seconded. The motion carried with 98% of the vote.

The final results of the election are as follows:

Senate Vice Chair/Chair Elect - Robert (Bob) Newman  
Faculty Representative on SEC - Deborah Worley  
Faculty Representatives on the C on C - Sandra Moritz, Rhonda Owens  
Staff Representative on SEC - Brian Schill  
Student Representative on SEC - Kaelan Reedy

The meeting adjourned at 4:36 p.m.

Scott Correll, Secretary

University Senate

## **Faculty Instructional Development Committee White Paper, April 2021**

### **Executive Summary**

A dramatic change in funding and organizational structure ca 2017-18 has resulted in the Faculty Instructional Development Committee (FIDC) losing all of its funding and most of its responsibilities—without any consultation with that committee or its parent body, the UND Senate. Members of the committee were gravely concerned about the impact of these changes upon the work carried out prior to that time by the Office of Instructional Development and the FIDC in promoting and developing programs aimed at fostering instructional excellence and innovation on a campus-wide basis. Because it was unclear to committee members where these funds had gone they wanted to determine whether or not colleges and their faculty had access to similar resources that would support the instructional excellence and innovation needed to promote the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning (SoTL) at UND. The FIDC was also deeply concerned about what this meant for the practice of shared governance on this campus.

With these concerns in mind, the then committee chair (with committee approval and input) launched a survey of UND's colleges designed to review the funding and other support provided at the college level for instructional development as well as to get some idea if best practices are being followed and if faculty are being made aware of instructional development opportunities.

It needs to be noted that only six of UND's colleges responded to the survey and that of necessity the survey was addressed to Deans and not faculty members, so the results cannot pretend to speak to the direct impact of funding changes upon individual faculty members. Having said this, the results of the survey, while mixed, indicate a lack of coordination and highlight the need for greater centralization of information and planning. The committee offers seven substantive recommendations aimed at addressing this and other problems highlighted by the survey. In every case the report also recommends a restoration of not only more central coordination but also of more involvement by the appropriate University Senate Committees in order to strengthen UND's culture of shared governance.

### **Preamble:**

Prior to the fiscal year 2017-18 the Faculty Instructional Development Committee (FIDC) of the UND Senate worked closely with the Office of Instructional Development (OID) to oversee the distribution of university funds designed to develop and encourage pedagogical excellence and innovation on this campus. In 2016-17, the last year before a series of budget cuts, administrative reorganizations and the implementation of the MIRA budget model took effect, this committee helped to disburse \$96,506 to faculty in aid of the campus-wide improvement of teaching. This budget consisted of \$50,106 in state appropriated funds — disbursed via flexible grants to individuals, departments and teams of faculty (\$20,646) and FIDC grants, which covered the costs of travel and attendance at teaching-related workshops and conferences (\$29,460). The remaining \$46,400 came from the Alumni Foundation and was used to fund various summer

projects — Summer Instructional Development Professorships (SIDPs), SIDP Cluster grants, Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) research, small-scale course development and assessment projects, and various mini-projects that could be best completed when faculty were not committed to their regular teaching schedules. In all of these endeavors the OID provided administrative oversight, intellectual leadership, cohort building and knowledge sharing as UND sought to keep abreast of best practices in pedagogy, disseminate those practices as widely as possible through innovative programs such as the On-Teaching “brown-bags” and newsletter and also kept committee members — and the larger UND community — aware of the correlation between fostering high-quality pedagogy and on-going reaccreditation by the Higher Learning Commission. While TTaDA absorbed many of these functions when OID was merged into that unit, the faculty role in distributing pedagogical support funds was lost as was the cross-campus conversation such funding facilitated. Prior to this merger FIDC members spent much of their time evaluating applications for the various grants and worked closely with the Director of the OID to ensure that UND faculty had opportunities to develop and excel as teaching scholars. After OID was rolled into the larger Teaching Transformation and Development Academy and the entire \$96,506 allotment mentioned above was lost to the FIDC, the FIDC’s role has been largely limited to a newly assigned function: the evaluation of the nominations and files for those put forward every year for UND’s campus-wide excellence in teaching and service awards.

To be sure, members of the FIDC are happy to play a role in recognizing the achievements of UND faculty via the Outstanding Faculty Awards that are handed out each year at the Founder’s Day banquet. Indeed, it is an extremely pleasant duty to evaluate the files of those who have been singled out by students and colleagues for the excellence of their work as teachers. However, it is also the case that this committee believes it can and should be doing even more to not only recognize excellence but to foster the development of instructors all across campus as was the case prior to 2017-18.

As deeply engaged campus citizens we are not Pollyannas: we are keenly aware that there have been several rounds of budget-cuts and attendant downsizing and/or reorganization of various units around campus over the past few years. However, we were concerned that these changes — made without any prior consultation with the FIDC, and therefore carried out with a complete lack of transparency — may have had a negative impact upon the availability of high-quality programs to improve teaching on campus. Under the previous model, faculty-driven funding around teaching excellence and innovation fostered a campus wide culture of collaboration and collegial support. Empowering faculty agency and voice around pedagogical best practices is an important part of reviving that culture. It is also the case that the removal of the FIDC from the decision-making process in such matters is not conducive to shared governance.

### **Actions:**

In order to ascertain if our concerns were well-taken, we decided to utilize the powers granted to us under the committee’s charge, which is extremely broad; indeed, the very first item listed under functions and responsibilities is this:



*In line with the University's Strategic Plan, be a collective advocate and activist for instructional development at the University. The Committee might do studies, sponsor programs, make recommendations, and seek additional funding which would support instructional improvement and the professional development of UND faculty, for all instructors at all ranks, as teachers.*

*This charge also notes that the FIDC is supposed to review funding and other support provided at the college level for instructional development, to ensure best practices are followed and faculty are aware of instructional development opportunities.*

Knowing that under the MIRA model it is now the responsibility of colleges to take on some of the functions previously overseen by the OID and FIDC in regards to funding faculty driven teaching innovation, the committee took it upon itself to conduct a study – via a survey of all the colleges – to determine if that work was being done. So, in the spring of 2020 the following was sent to the Dean of every academic unit.

*Dear Dean ....*

*I am writing to you today in my capacity as Chair of the Faculty Instructional Development Committee (FIDC). Under the terms of our Senate charge the FIDC is supposed to “review funding and other support provided at the college level for instructional development, to ensure best practices are followed and faculty are aware of instructional development opportunities.”*

*Of course, those of us serving on the committee recognize that this is an extremely busy and difficult time for all colleges. As a result, we are loathe to place any more burdens upon you or your staff. However, given how directly this pandemic has affected UND's teaching mission – reminding us all of the centrality of this mission to the University's long-term health and relevance – and also keenly aware that the Higher Learning Commission will insist that we can “outline the Institution's plan for assuring quality” in terms of our instructional mission – we felt that we should go on with this survey that we had originally planned to roll out in March of 2020. (We are aware of one-time funding being made available for online course development during the summer of 2020. We ask that you please delineate between these funds and the funding that is available regularly in the college.)*

- 1) How much does your college currently spend on instructional development? (Please construe this very broadly. This would include funding for teaching-related workshops, funding for faculty travel to attend teaching-related conferences and workshops, funding for faculty stipends to develop courses, grants for the acquisition of teaching-related materials, financial support to help faculty adopt new pedagogical approaches and to apply new technologies to courses, to fund “summer professorships,” to help new hires – tenure track and non-tenure track – establish themselves as teachers etc.)*
- 2) By how much – if at all – have you increased your college's financial commitment to instructional development from 2017-18 to the present? (again, this would include funding for all the categories listed above)*

- 3) *What mechanisms does your college employ to advertise the availability of such instructional development opportunities to faculty?*
- 4) *Please provide a list of all the major initiatives supporting instructional development within your college.*
- 5) *Has your college developed any plans to further increase the funding related to the instructional challenges associated with on-line courses?*
- 6) *Please tell us if, in your estimation, we need more centralized aid in handling instructional development at UND (i.e., through TTaDa, the Provost's Office) or more money in general for this work (either at the college or university level.) Any specific recommendations would be most appreciated.*

Given the circumstances of this past year, and the simple fact that responding to the survey was voluntary, not all the survey results came in immediately and several colleges made no response until Fall 2020. Indeed, there are still two responses outstanding and the nature of the replies themselves do not make them easy to quantify. However, despite these shortcomings, we felt that there was enough data to present the following summary.

### **Results of the Survey:**

To begin, one result which was clear is that all of UND's colleges have a strong commitment to fostering excellence in teaching. That is very good news indeed. However, it is also apparent that there is a great disparity in what the various colleges are doing regarding the funding of teaching related matters.

Of the six colleges responding to question #2 (*By how much – if at all – have you increased your college's financial commitment to instructional development from 2017-18 to the present?*) two colleges — Arts & Sciences and Medicine & Health Sciences — reported no increase in such funding. On the positive side BPA, Engineering & Mines and the Odegard School all indicated substantial increases, with the Law School reporting a smaller, yet significant increase. So, the majority of UND's colleges have invested more resources into pedagogy. Based upon comments made in the various responses, much of this new funding has been directed towards improving and expanding online and hybrid courses and on employing various forms of educational technology.

It is also clear that most of the colleges do not yet have a coordinated and consistent method for reaching out to faculty concerning teaching-related programs — although all are trying. Traditional methods, such as targeted outreach to Department Chairs (A&S, CEM), direct communication of funding opportunities from Deans to Faculty (Law and the Odegard School — via a Dean's Forum), are the norm. However, it must be pointed out that the SMHS has a truly robust and well-coordinated program of outreach to faculty.

In terms of plans to provide even more college-level funding for the instructional challenges related to online teaching, this is once again a very mixed bag. A&S, Law and BPA had no immediate plans in this regard, aside from encouraging faculty to participate in UND's larger online initiative. The SMHS is planning no new initiative but is already engaged in strengthening

online accessibility through existing funding and budget lines. The Odegard School and the CEM are at the other extreme and are investing considerable resources into online pedagogy and course development. They, like the other colleges, are tapping into the expertise available at TTaDA to aid in this work. However, like the Medical School, these two colleges are also devoting in-house resources to ensure that discipline specific content is handled appropriately within the college. And, in the case of CEM, are very clear in the desire to develop additional sources of funding in order to place two engineering focused instructional designers on staff.

Finally, the responses to question #6 regarding the potential need for *more centralized aid in handling instructional development at UND (e.g., through TTaDa, the Provost's Office) or more money in general for this work (either at the college or university level)* provided the most consistent responses. The consensus was clear, the respondents believed that more centralized aid and coordination would definitely enhance what is currently being done at the college level. But, perhaps surprisingly, the other point made quite consistently in these responses was that it was not all about money. As one respondent (from A&S) put it:

*Having more centralized support would be welcomed. Funding is part of this, but it's not the only – or perhaps even most important – part. Initiatives handled centrally help with cohort and community building across campus, and often lead to the development of relationships that facilitate the dissemination of good ideas, collaborative projects focused on pedagogy, etc.*

In much the same spirit, the respondent from the Odegard School urged the FIDC to

*host some faculty best practices workshops. TTaDA is great for helping out with the logistics, but I also want to learn how faculty are using the technologies to enhance their classes and make the most of the remote instructional periods. I know we have some great creative faculty, doing amazing things...I want to hear from them too!*

And the SMHS respondent made the following observation:

*In the past, many faculty members, especially in health sciences departments, were awarded travel grants and instructional development grants from the Senate Scholarly Activities Committee (SSAC) and the Office of Instructional Development (OID). At one time, SMHS faculty were also selected as UND Bush Teaching Scholars. Many of these past available resources provided university-based incentive to faculty to engage in instructional development activities and educational scholarship. Providing similar resources again would be a positive step. But it's not just a matter of finances. A system of evaluation and reward for faculty, i.e., promotion and tenure, that clearly demonstrates the value of quality instruction and the scholarship of teaching and learning, and a culture of active participation in professional development opportunities must continue to be promoted at UND.*

## Conclusions:

After evaluating the somewhat scattered data that is available to the committee and particularly after reading the thoughtful comments of survey respondents, a few conclusions follow.

- 1) Of all the colleges represented in this survey it seems that UND's largest college, A&S, has had the greatest struggle to make up for the loss of funding opportunities in the realm of ongoing pedagogical development and SoTL research. This is not a surprising discovery given the College's financial difficulties over the past decade, but it is still a matter of concern. Indeed, given that college's centrality to the Liberal Arts mission of the university and its role in providing the core Essential Studies courses which every UND student needs to graduate, it is a problem of considerable magnitude.
- 2) Each and every college which responded has a strong commitment to fostering excellence in teaching and has taken active measures to make resources available to faculty.
- 3) There is a definite need for greater coordination both within and among the colleges. As several respondents noted, although TTaDA provides excellent service and support in terms of instructional development activities, the entire campus would benefit by having a university-wide agency that would actively foster the exchange of ideas, innovations and best-practices that are being developed in the various "silos" of the university.
- 4) The move to more online and hybridized course delivery raises all sorts of pedagogical issues – not all of which can be solved by improved technology or additional funding. Those colleges which have been leading the way – Medicine & Health Sciences, Engineering & Mines and the Odegard School – have managed to create new funding sources or re-directed existing sources to launch well thought-out and robust programs. The entire campus could benefit from their experience but at present the forums to share this expertise simply do not exist. Nor do we have the institutional recognition of the importance of excellence in pedagogy which would make it "worthwhile" for faculty to participate in such forums even if they were available.
- 5) The School of Medicine & Health Sciences respondent noted that the funding which the School's faculty members had been able to avail themselves of through FIDC and the Senate Scholarly Activities Committees' (SSAC) grants was no longer available. This is an important point to note on two separate grounds. First, it highlights the removal of tens of thousands of dollars' worth of grant money available to faculty members from sources outside of their particular college. If this is something to be lamented from the perspective of UND's best funded colleges, which have quite solid professional development funds, it is probably catastrophic for those who work within colleges with more limited resources. This contributes to growing disparities between UND's colleges. Second, it underlines (inadvertently) the erosion of shared governance at UND. Two University Senate Committees, the FIDC and the SSAC, were both stripped of all of their funding and most of their *raison d'être* by administrative fiat.

## Recommendations:

- 1) Initiate discussions between the Senate (including an FIDC representative) and the Office of the Provost to restore all or part of the funding which it had previously distributed through the FIDC.
- 2) Initiate discussions between the Senate (including an FIDC representative) and the Alumni Foundation to restore and increase that body's funding for campus-wide, faculty-driven initiatives, related to promoting excellence in teaching at UND.
- 3) Convene a meeting of all college-level personnel responsible for professional and pedagogical development with representatives of TTaDA, the Provost's Office and the Senate. The purpose of this meeting would be to cross-pollinate by sharing best-practices on a campus-wide basis and reestablishing the role of shared governance in the process.
- 4) Pending the renewal of funding, the FIDC should initiate and host, with the support of TTaDA, a new series of "on-teaching" seminars that would share the latest insights and experiences of UND's talented teachers with their colleagues across campus.
- 5) Pending the renewal of funding, the FIDC, in conjunction with representatives of TTaDA, should re-institute competitive Flex and FIDC grants.
- 6) Pending the renewal of Alumni Foundation funding, the FIDC, in conjunction with representatives of TTaDA, should institute a new series of openly competitive summer grants for faculty and teams of faculty who are seeking to develop new courses, implement the latest high impact practices and conduct Scholarship of Teaching and Learning research – for both online and face-to-face settings. These grants should be overseen by faculty members who make up the FIDC.
- 7) Pending the renewal of funding, the FIDC, in conjunction with representatives of TTaDA, should re-institute intensive summer workshops on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and pedagogy — workshops that would be open to incoming faculty even before they commence their formal appointments at UND.

At the heart of these recommendations is a desire on the part of the FIDC to ensure that UND is doing all that it can to develop the skillset of new and experienced teachers on this campus. The loss of funding to help faculty travel to workshops and conferences related to the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning, and the loss of campus wide forums which helped to share insights gained from participation at such events, is keenly felt by many members of the FIDC as well as several of the respondents to the survey. Indeed, the committee feels that funding for such pedagogically focused travel and workshop participation is priority #1. By the same token, committee members wish to ensure that UND is living up to – and surpassing – the expectations of the Higher Learning Commission in regard to both the development and assessment of teaching on this campus and to fostering a greater spirit of shared governance – matters which are of considerable importance to the HLC. If the recommendations outlined above are carried out, we feel confident that UND will be doing the right thing for its students, its faculty, its staff and for the future of the institution.

Honors Committee  
University Senate Report  
August 2020-May 2021

Faculty (election term indicated for those elected by Senate; voting)

Heather Terrell (chair)	(A&S)	2022
Enru Wang	(A&S)	2023
Soizik Laguette	(JDOSAS)	2023
Wayne Seames	(CEM)	2023
Michelle Sauer	(A&S)	2021
Masfique Mehedi	(MED)	2021
Sonja Brandt	(EHD)	2022
Mark Jendrysik (vice chair)	(NCoBPA)	2022
Kristen Borysewicz	(LIB)	2024

Student Members (appointed; voting)

Nathan Moe  
Taylor Roehl  
Travis Dean  
Emmanuel Musa  
Naomi Budziszewski  
Sydney Menne  
Ranju Dhungana  
Laura Farder

Ex-Officio Members / Honors Faculty and Director (Non-voting)

Rebecca Rozelle-Stone	(Honors Director)
David Cason	(Honors)
Merie Kirby	(Honors)

The Honors Committee met four times during the 2020-2021 academic year and assisted the Honors Program Director, Rebecca Rozelle-Stone, with the following issues:

1. Review of faculty applications for proposed HON courses for the Spring 2021 and Fall 2021 semesters.
2. Clarification of standards for approval of HON courses. We adjusted the instructions for HON course applications accordingly--revisions included language about how long the course would be approved, the kind of feedback that would be obtained about the course, and a request for how the course provides an enriched experience.
3. Creation of a Qualtrics survey for feedback from HON students about HON courses to foster better assessment of student experience.
4. Election of vice chair/future committee chair, Mark Jendrysik, who will serve as chair for the 2021-2022 AY.