In Attendance:

Cathy Archer               Jerry Scoby
David Eisler               Mishelle Stone
Fritz Erickson             Allen Sutherby
Don Green                  Morgan Toms and SG guest
Leonard Johnson            Nate Tymes
Paul Blake for Michelle Johnston Robert von der Osten
John Norton                Chris Westerkamp
David Pilgrim              John Willey
Matt Pinter                Helen Woodman
Kristen Salomonson         Leroy Wright

Guests:
Ann Breitenwischer, Julie Coon, Don Flickinger, Fred Heck, Kitty Manley, Carol Quigley,
Theresa Raglin, Todd Stanislav, Robbie Teahen

Action/Updates:

1. September Meeting Summary
   SPARC members reviewed and approved the minutes of the September 14, 2010 meeting. The October 12 meeting was cancelled.

2. “Ferris First” - Update
   Chair Leonard Johnson reported that the membership of “Ferris First” has been finalized. The members are excited to participate and are looking forward to the work of the committee. The first meeting is set for Saturday, December 11, from 10am-3pm.
   Co-chairs; Don Green and Susan Jones
   Members are:
   Susan Jones, COB (Marketing) – Co-Chair
   Don Green, CPTS), - Co-Chair
   Mike Bouthillier, COP
   Dan Cronk, COB / MIM
   Fritz Erikson, Provost
   Ziggy Kozicki, AHS / Health Care Systems Admin
   Kitty Manley, COEHS / Teacher Education
   Allison Popp, COB / Marketing
   Piram Prikasam, International Center
   Troy Tissue, Student Affairs / Admissions
   Leonard Johnson, COEHS – Ex-Officio
   Robert VonderOsten, A&S – Ex-Officio
3. **Energy Task Force - Update**  
VP Scoby shared the charge, new membership and timeline of the 2010-11 Energy Conservation Task Force. One student member is needed to complete the 16 member group. Meetings are scheduled for Nov. 22 and Dec. 7, 2010. The task force is moving forward. It was suggested that more students be engaged in the work of the task force to provide learning opportunities and use their ideas and commitment. VP Scoby assured SPARC that the subgroup is planning to and is pleased to engage students.

**Discussion:**

4. **Opening Remarks:** “The ideas we help to generate may well be our greatest resources.”
Chair Johnson shared the following:

“It is no coincidence that several individuals with significant decision-making authority for allocating resources are members of SPARC. Therefore each meeting provides faculty in particular a significant opportunity to share ideas and provide insights that will help frame the focus of our efforts on both the achievement of existing initiatives and the possible identification of new initiatives helpful in furthering our progress toward the realization of the goals of the strategic plan.

Therefore, the primary goal of our meeting today will be to take a look at the data presented on the topics of facilities management and student success, and engage in a discussion about not only what we are currently doing, but also explore what we might yet do to further that progress.”

5. **Facilities Management**
   a. **Facilities Master Plan (cont. from September meeting)**
      i. VP Scoby distributed “Highlights of Proposed Changes in Five Year Plan,” which includes items done, doing, near term and future issues within the master plan. He shared themes of academic, housing and parking within the plans and responded to questions concerning coordination.
      ii. He then provided a handout entitled “University Center Renovation and Related Projects,” which describes the renovation need, related project pieces, and broad timeline estimates of the phasing for remodeling the University (currently Rankin) Center. To prepare for the University Center, it is important to develop parking for this facility. This will require removing Masselink Hall. This will necessitate infrastructure moves of cable TV, fire alarm system hub, dining and housing card system, voice communications servers, VoIP phone system, emergency phones system, copper and fiber optics networks Internet services and Bulldog Radio. Much planning has begun, with much more to come regarding temporary relocations, timelines, donors, architectural drawings, etc. Healthy debates will be held across the University community regarding the uses and offices/spaces to be placed in the building. VP Scoby is hoping to take the project to the Board of Trustees at the February Finance Committee and the March full Board meeting. He requested that additional comments, suggestions and questions be emailed to him.

President Eisler commented that students deserve a better place to meet. Additional parking near the facility will be important. Razing Masselink and Carlisle to accommodate the parking will be a critical piece of the phasing timeline. He is committed to not putting the full cost of the burden on the students. VP Burcham has been charged with leading the project to meet with stakeholders and begin gathering the actual physical building ideas/input from across the University. The planning must consider future needs of the institution as well as focus on commuter student needs and access. It is expected that phase will begin next semester.
6. Student Success

a. Student Perspectives – “Student Success”
Chair Johnson compiled the results of student surveys conducted by Doug Haneline, Nate Tymes, Cathy Archer, Jim Jones, Leonard Johnson, and Helen Woodman. Students were asked to respond to the following two questions:

“What does ‘student success’ mean to you?”
Responses were: Getting good grades; getting a good job; timely degree completion; happiness/quality of life; career preparation/apply learning; being ‘challenged’

“What can FSU do to support you in your efforts to succeed?”
Responses were: knowledgeable, caring, involved, available and response advisors/professors; support services an student activities, monetary support and/or lower tuition; relevant, quality instruction / career preparation; internships and networking opportunities; FSU is doing a good job already; courses available; FLITE open longer

Many comments were as expected. Surprisingly, students did not report graduating as “success”; nor did they say they would work harder for better grades.

b. Obstacles and Recommendations – Mastery Learning
Professor Kitty Manley described the philosophy of mastery learning. In her classes, failure is not an option; grading is A, B, or not yet (Incomplete). All students need to meet the standards; this concept recognizes that some people take longer to learn concepts; she allows students to resubmit and retest to guarantee mastery of the content. The student’s grade remains at incomplete until the assignment(s) is finished. This takes longer and a fair amount of the instructor’s time, but is a worthwhile commitment.

Discussion revolved around how the philosophy could work in career-driven courses; if it would work better by having a contract with the students, including a deadline for the coursework; how SLA courses already have a mandate for tutoring, which is working; and how faculty load could be reviewed to assist instructors using this concept. A suggestion was made to determine the number of classes and faculty members who use this pedagogy currently. Then it would be possible to designate mastery learning courses and move toward assessment of outcomes to demonstrate mastery. A comment was shared that some students do not prefer a pass/fail method and do not believe that allowing extended time is “real world.” The group mentioned some inhibitors to moving to the mastery philosophy.

Comments were shared regarding a problem for some students with degree completion, including a recommendation to rethink how to deal with assisting a student who needs a course that is not offered that semester. Becoming more flexible with workload or providing more strategic planning/structure of courses for a cohort of students could reduce this problem.

c. Faculty Perspectives – General Education
Professor Fred Heck presented the status of the General Education Program Review, including a review of the timeline, future plans and implementation of the process. He shared the LEAP handout entitled “The Essential Learning Outcomes” and stated that this or likely something similar will become the revised General Ed Philosophy Statement and learning outcomes. There are many models and ways this can be achieved. The delivery will be difficult and will require additional University-wide discussion. For now, the discussion concerns what learning outcomes are or should be.
The task force members are meeting with colleges to gather feedback on learning outcome statements, and will then craft Ferris student learning outcomes for the General Ed program. After institution-wide agreement of a set of a few, broadly-stated learning outcomes across the full student experience, it will be taken to the Academic Senate. Adoption of a set of outcomes would serve to integrate learning across the whole University experience for every student. It will also serve to break down silos. He reported that there has been good response on the college level with effective college meetings.

Town Hall meetings for faculty, staff and students are scheduled for Nov. 18-19 to gather more input on the first draft, dated October 2010. The current goal is to use further comments to edit the document, take to Academic Senate to approve by the end of the academic year, and implement next year.

Don Flickinger shared that he has been a facilitator in the process; however, this project has been faculty driven with very good discussions and input.

d. Stats on “Timely Completion”

SPARC member and Dean of Enrollment Services Kristen Salomonson distributed retention and graduation rate statistics. She reported that data may be pulled by many variables, if other slices are of value for review and analysis. Ferris is making gains over the years in graduation rates.

These data show that transfer students may not complete a specific program, but may switch between college programs before graduation. We now can provide and receive student transfer data to/from the clearinghouse. There are ways to use the clearinghouse data to our advantage, and we must figure out how to do that better. It should not be considered as a failure if a student transfers out to graduate at another institution or vice versa.

VP Pilgrim requested more data on the graduation rates of people of color and of TIP students. We have existing services to support TIP students and their retention is good – 64% for TIP; 67% for first year students.

e. 2011 Welcome Back Week Activities

Chair Johnson introduced FCTL Director Todd Stanislav, who requested suggestions for topic content for the 2011 Faculty Welcome Back Week sessions. Recommendations included: Mastery Learning; Panel of students to provide direct input to faculty; Quality of instruction strategies; Academic planning for students; Balance; Sexual harassment; Faculty responsibilities; How to engage students in discussions; Having difficult conversations with students; Effective conversations and listening; How to deal with attitudes, cell phones, etc. in the classroom; How to negotiate with students; Classroom etiquette; Norming Campaign re plagiarism, academic honesty, etc.; Learner-centered thinking and the value of education; Strategies of having a welcoming heart and how to approach the first class, setting the tone in the classroom and creating an environment to engage the students.

Closing / Next meeting date:
Chair Johnson thanked members for their participation.
The next meeting will be December 14, 2010, 3-5pm in WCCC for a discussion of Student Engagement.

Adjourned 4:50pm
Submitted by Elaine R. Kamptner