

Broad feedback from Policy Committee on ADA document format and track changes issues:

1. Final documents will be checked for ADA format.
2. Future review materials will be sent out in PDF format for all campus comment period.

Policy committee responses are in red. Faculty comments are in blue. Feedback from DE&I committee is in green. No feedback from other groups was received.

There are no changes on this document. I had to download the file into Word to see the minor changes. This needs to be fixed ASAP so that the community knows what has been changed.

PDF format documents were sent in review reminder. Future review materials will be in PDF format with track changes.

Add Diversity & Equity Coordinator position in Subpart D

Where should this be added in Subpart D? What is the rationale behind this recommendation?

Review to make sure it lets students know where they can claim their funds/ sign for their funds after awarded because they only have 60 days to claim

Added that students should sign form in Student Life Office and collect payment from Accounting.

The policy in its current form was written by Student Senate. Can we please make sure that the current student Senate is aware of this history and is in full support of the proposed changes?

I have a comment on the assignment of credit hours policy regarding the final exam policy. I would like this campus to be one in which the course met at the regular scheduled times during finals week. I know that this would require some faculty to break their final exam into two parts but it would be a much more student friendly schedule. All of us have had students that set their work schedule based on the class meeting times and have to scramble during finals week.

o @ # @
want the language of the policy to limit any future possibility of changing finals week to be more student-friendly. Perhaps the language could say a total (or a minimum) of 120 minutes shall be provided for finals week. That could leave the door open for fitting that time within the scheduled days/hours that class normally meets during.

Any changes to the proposed final exam structure would need to be taken to the Calendar Committee for recommendations to the Presidents of NHCC and MSCF.

On the Credit Hour Assignment

Based on the editing marks, I am not completely sure if I'm reading the intended text. Are we allowing faculty to fail or deregister students who do not attend the first day of a course? I am in support of that, if it is what is meant. I am thinking of the students who join lab classes late, through the drop/add week and miss the introductory lab with safety training. Currently, since I have understood that we must accept the students up to a week after the start of the course, we must take extra time with them to meet regulations for providing lab safety training, though usually these late-adding students and others who don't attend the first day for other reasons have a very high rate of not successfully completing the course.

The committee discussed your comment at length. We encourage faculty to contact students who do not attend the first class, especially if there is a waiting list for the class. The final decision about whether to drop a student for non-attendance after the first class remains with the Provost and will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

Same issue with track changes. Otherwise, no issue.
See note above.

conduct officer can take.

The conduct officer at NHCC is Elton Dahn, so that line refers to him.

Change part 4 to read college Vice President instead of President

It had already read Vice President. This was updated to say Provost to reflect the newly created position.

Revisit who has the final decision making authorst2180 1 21811 0.00000912 0 612 92 4d3ET60000912 01 Tfd.439 0.38d3ET00

From a pragmatic standpoint, faculty and their supervisors struggle to keep track of three evaluation methods over a three year timespan. I cannot see how five evaluation methods over a 6 year timespan improves this.

The intent with saying 5 is that one of the proposed options is a peer evaluation, which we cannot require someone to complete per the MSCF contract. So, if someone chose to use student evaluations twice in lieu of the peer evaluation, they could do that. There would, however, still be an annual evaluation – one evaluation each year. The intent was to try to get a broad range of types of feedback because of unconscious bias in student feedback. The other part of that is that else instead (e.g., trying to do a self-reflection multiple times to avoid a dean observation).

rotate through at least three different evaluation methods over a three-

Link is to 5.32.1, not 5.32.

Corrected when reminder for review was sent.

Same issue with track changes. See note above.

@ # = # or keeping as is. The point of the last sentence of Part 3, Subpart B was to ensure that a physical copy was maintained in # 8 ven that the College is thinking about having electronic archives, this sentence may no longer be needed.
Changed to relevant custodians.

Same issue with track changes. No other comments. See note above.

Same issue with track changes.
See note above.

h o # @ 7 = 7 @ prefer the older language, to be honest. Is this change being prompted by State Statute?
We have changed the languag

The Review Action table is not up-to-date with all the bargaining units and the Diversity group.
Updated.