TO: Dr. Patricia Humphrey Chair, Senate Executive Committee
FROM: Brooks A. Keel, President
DATE: September 16, 2014
SUBJECT: September 15, 2014, Faculty Senate Recommendation: Recommended changes to the “early alert/midterm grades” policy

Following review of the recommendation adopted by the Faculty Senate at the September 15, 2014, Faculty Senate meeting, as provided in your memo of September 16, 2014, I have approved the motion below.

MOTION:

The ASC moves that
1) The reference to midterm grades in “Early Alert/Midterm Grade” be removed, making them simply “Early Alert.”
2) The early alert options are changed and simplified to include the following options:
   S  Satisfactory
   UG Unsatisfactory: Grades
   UM Unsatisfactory: Missing/Missed assessment
   UA Unsatisfactory: Attendance
   UP Unsatisfactory: Lack of engaged Participation
   UC Unsatisfactory: Combination of issues
   ID Insufficient Data

Implementation date: Spring 2015

RATIONALE:

1. Although the Early Alert/Midterm Grade window opens at the beginning of the 3rd week of classes, the vast majority of faculty submissions come at the deadline (34th day). This deadline comes at a point too late in the semester to allow for meaningful intervention on the part of academic advisors, the Academic Success Center and other units. Intervening before the
withdrawal date is particularly difficult. Even if faculty are communicating progress in the course clearly through Folio, not submitting formally through WINGS means that advisors and others are not in a position to identify patterns across courses. Faculty often do not feel they have substantive enough assessment to submit a grade earlier that reflects true course progress. The reference to grades may be one reason faculty are reticent to submit early when they have not assessed a significant percentage of the course content, although the Early Alert/Midterm Grade is not a grade in the formal sense even in its present form. It is more properly simply an early alert.

2. a. This represents fewer options than we currently have (seven instead of ten). “UC” now replaces the various, specific combinations of issues a student may exhibit.

b. There is a new category for “missing/missed assessment.” The rationale is that faculty may feel more comfortable in assigning this alert even if the assessment were minor. Any missing grade is cause for an early alert.

c. The intent behind the other new category (“ID”) is that it would be used sparingly, usually when students classified as freshmen are enrolled in upper-level courses not designed for first-year students (and therefore which may have less frequent assessment).

d. The ASC recommended removing the generic “U” altogether to encourage faculty to use the more detailed descriptors when submitting the alerts, but also because it seems there are enough options provided.
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TO: Dr. Brooks A. Keel, President
FROM: Dr. Jean Bartels, Ph.D., RN
      Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
DATE: September 16, 2014

SUBJECT: Recommended changes to the “early alert/midterm grades” policy

I recommend approval of the following motion presented at September 15, 2014, Faculty Senate meeting.

MOTION:

The ASC moves that
1) The reference to midterm grades in “Early Alert/Midterm Grade” be removed, making them simply “Early Alert.”
2) The early alert options are changed and simplified to include the following options:
   S    Satisfactory
   UG   Unsatisfactory: Grades
   UM   Unsatisfactory: Missing/Missed assessment
   UA   Unsatisfactory: Attendance
   UP   Unsatisfactory: Lack of engaged Participation
   UC   Unsatisfactory: Combination of issues
   ID   Insufficient Data

Implementation date: Spring 2015

RATIONALE:

1. Although the Early Alert/Midterm Grade window opens at the beginning of the 3rd week of classes, the vast majority of faculty submissions come at the deadline (34th day). This deadline comes at a point too late in the semester to allow for meaningful intervention on the part of academic advisors, the Academic Success Center and other units. Intervening before the withdrawal date is particularly difficult. Even if faculty are communicating progress in the course clearly through Folio, not submitting formally through WINGS means that advisors and others are not in a position to identify patterns across courses. Faculty often do not feel they have substantive enough assessment to submit a grade earlier that reflects true course progress. The reference to grades may be one reason faculty are reticent to submit early when
they have not assessed a significant percentage of the course content, although the Early Alert/Midterm Grade is not a grade in the formal sense even in its present form. It is more properly simply an early alert.

2. a. This represents fewer options than we currently have (seven instead of ten). “UC” now replaces the various, specific combinations of issues a student may exhibit.

b. There is a new category for “missing/missed assessment.” The rationale is that faculty may feel more comfortable in assigning this alert even if the assessment were minor. Any missing grade is cause for an early alert.

c. The intent behind the other new category (“ID”) is that it would be used sparingly, usually when students classified as freshmen are enrolled in upper-level courses not designed for first-year students (and therefore which may have less frequent assessment).

d. The ASC recommended removing the generic “U” altogether to encourage faculty to use the more detailed descriptors when submitting the alerts, but also because it seems there are enough options provided.
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TO: Dr. Brooks A. Keel, President
FROM: Pat Humphrey (COSM), Chair, Senate Executive Committee
DATE: September 16, 2014
SUBJECT: Recommended changes to the “early alert/midterm grades” policy

I am pleased to report that the Senate recommends approval of the amended motion presented at the September 15, 2014, Faculty Senate meeting.

MOTION:
The ASC moves that
1) The reference to midterm grades in “Early Alert/Midterm Grade” be removed, making them simply “Early Alert.”
2) The early alert options are changed and simplified to include the following options:

   S  Satisfactory 
   UG Unsatisfactory: Grades 
   UM Unsatisfactory: Missing/Missed assessment 
   UA Unsatisfactory: Attendance 
   UP Unsatisfactory: Lack of engaged Participation 
   UC Unsatisfactory: Combination of issues 
   ID Insufficient Data 

Implementation date: Spring 2015

RATIONALE:
1. Although the Early Alert/Midterm Grade window opens at the beginning of the 3rd week of classes, the vast majority of faculty submissions come at the deadline (34th day). This deadline comes at a point too late in the semester to allow for meaningful intervention on the part of academic advisors, the Academic Success Center and other units. Intervening before the withdrawal date is particularly difficult. Even if faculty are communicating progress in the course clearly through Folio, not submitting formally through WINGS means that advisors and others are not in a position to identify patterns across courses. Faculty often do not feel they have substantive enough assessment to submit a grade earlier that reflects true course progress. The reference to grades may be one reason faculty are reticent to submit early when they have not assessed a significant percentage of the course content, although the Early Alert/Midterm Grade
is not a grade in the formal sense even in its present form. It is more properly simply an early alert.

2. a. This represents fewer options than we currently have (seven instead of ten). “UC” now replaces the various, specific combinations of issues a student may exhibit.

b. There is a new category for “missing/missed assessment.” The rationale is that faculty may feel more comfortable in assigning this alert even if the assessment were minor. Any missing grade is cause for an early alert.

c. The intent behind the other new category (“ID”) is that it would be used sparingly, usually when students classified as freshmen are enrolled in upper-level courses not designed for first-year students (and therefore which may have less frequent assessment).

d. The ASC recommended removing the generic “U” altogether to encourage faculty to use the more detailed descriptors when submitting the alerts, but also because it seems there are enough options provided.
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Motion Request

SHORT TITLE:
(Please provide a short descriptive title that would be suitable for inclusion in the Senate Agenda.)

Recommended changes to the “early alert/midterm grades” policy

MOTION(s):
(Please write out your motion in the exact form/wording on which you want the Senate to vote.)

The ASC moves that 1) The reference to midterm grades in “Early Alert/Midterm Grade” be removed, making them simply “Early Alert.” 2) The early alert options are changed and simplified to include the following options: S Satisfactory US Unsatisfactory: Grades UM Unsatisfactory: Missing/Missed assessment UA Unsatisfactory: Attendance UP Unsatisfactory: Lack of engagement Participation UC Unsatisfactory: Combination of issues ID Insufficient Data Implementation date: Fall 2014

RATIONALE(s):
(Please explain why the motion should be considered by the Faculty Senate, remembering that the Senate does not deal with issues limited to individual colleges or administrative units. Include pertinent data and source references for information and/or language.)

1. Although the Early Alert/Midterm Grade window opens at the beginning of the 3rd week of classes, the vast majority of faculty submissions come at the deadline (34th day). This deadline comes at a point too late in the semester to allow for meaningful intervention on the part of academic advisors, the Academic Success Center and other units. Intervening before the withdrawal date is particularly difficult. Even if faculty are communicating progress in the course clearly through Folio, not submitting directly through WINGS means that advisors and others are not in a position to identify patterns across courses. Faculty often do not feel they have substantive enough assessment to submit a grade earlier that reflects true course progress. The reference to grades may be one reason faculty are reticent to submit early when they have not assessed a significant percentage of the course content, although the Early Alert/Midterm Grade is not a grade in the formal sense even in its present form. It is more properly simply an early alert. 2. a. This represents fewer options than we currently have (seven instead of ten). “UC” now replaces the various, specific combinations of issues a student may exhibit. b. There is a new category for “missing/missed assessment.” The rationale is that faculty may feel more comfortable in assigning this alert even if the assessment were minor. Any missing grade is cause for an early alert. c. The intent behind the other new category (“ID”) is that it would be used sparingly, usually when students classified as freshmen are enrolled in upper-level courses not designed for first-year students (and therefore which may have less frequent assessment). d. The ASC recommended removing the generic “U” altogether to encourage faculty to use the more detailed descriptors when submitting the alerts, but also because it seems there are enough options provided.

If you have an attachment, press the button below to attach to form.
ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY

This site is for use exclusively by Georgia Southern University faculty, staff, and administrators. Submissions are reviewed by the SEC for relevance to the mission and business of the Faculty Senate. This site is a tool not for debate but solely for information exchange. Redundant and contentious submissions will not be accepted. Note to faculty users: Double-check your data before submitting, because the data cannot be edited afterward.

Approval

Response:
Approved

SEC Response:
5/23/2014

Approved. These were approved for the June 2014 meeting, but a quorum was not present, so they were held until the September 2014 meeting.

Senate Response:
9/15/2014

Approved. Amended to take effect Spring 2015.

Presidents Response:
9/16/2014

Approved.