

## Standing Committees

### Committee on Academic Advising

#### 2020-2021 Annual Report

Chair: Brett Hill

#### Overview

The committee focused almost exclusively on the Carole Herrick Academic Advising Award this year. Given COVID circumstances the chair made the decision to limit committee responsibilities to essential tasks.

#### Carole Herrick Award

This year the committee implemented a survey process developed in previous years to solicit nominations for the award with an online survey. The committee addressed by email discussion updates to the questions used in the survey, and to the list of possible nominees. With Randy Peterson's assistance, an email was sent to every Hendrix student, requesting nominations with a link to the updated survey (See Appendices). This year students submitted a total of 86 nominations for 44 different faculty/staff.

On March 4<sup>th</sup> at 1:00 pm the committee met by MS Teams to discuss the nominations. Our unanimous conclusion was to recommend the award to Dr. Dearolf for the high quality of her nominations this year and for her consistently high level of advising over many years.

#### Future Work

With the return to normal protocols next year the committee might revisit its mission. It is likely that some aspects of the remote advising environment will remain in practice and there may be a role for the committee to help the Office of Academic Advising think about changing conditions and their implications.

Another question to consider is the letter sent to non-winning nominees. This practice was begun several years ago when there were many fewer nominees. The letter still seems like a net positive outcome that should be sustained, but the process and wording might be reconsidered.

#### **Appendix A**

##### ***Information about the Carole Herrick Award for Excellence in Academic Advising***

#### **Carole Herrick Award for Excellence in Academic Advising**

The Carole Herrick Award for Excellence in Academic Advising is named in honor of Carole Herrick, Professor of Music (1980-2014) and Associate Provost for Advising and Retention (1997-2014). The Herrick Award serves to recognize and reward high-quality academic advising, which includes contributions in advising that help students formulate and achieve their intellectual, career, and personal goals. By highlighting examples of outstanding advising, the Herrick Award identifies professional models and celebrates the role that academic advising plays in the College's educational mission.

#### Selection Process

Nominations are solicited from students each year. The Academic Advising Committee reviews the nominations and makes an award recommendation to the Committee on Faculty for final approval. The Provost presents the award during the spring semester. Nominations will be evaluated based on information provided by students supporting effective qualities and practices of outstanding advisors. These might include evidence of commitment to advisees such as the following:

- Availability to advise and mentor students
- Interest in the student's academic, career, and life goals
- Dissemination of correct information and referral to appropriate sources
- In addition, evidence of a commitment to advising will be considered through advising surveys, number of advisees, and participation in advising events, discussions or training.
- Student nominations are not limited to the academic advisor of record but may include other faculty who have excelled in an advisory capacity.
- Nominations and input on decisions may also be considered from the Office of the Registrar and the Office of Advising and Academic Success.
- Previous winners of the Herrick Award may not be nominated.

## **Appendix B**

### ***Questions for the 2021 Herrick Award Student Survey***

1. What is your student ID?
2. Who is the professor that you are nominating?

The following questions should be ranked from 1 – 5 (where 1 is 'not at all' and 5 is 'very much so'):

3. Is this faculty advisor/mentor valuable in helping you create your academic schedule?
4. Does this faculty advisor/mentor listen to your ideas, both academic and otherwise?
5. Does this faculty advisor/mentor provide valuable support and guidance that is helping you to develop as a whole person? (This advice may help you develop career skills, personal skills, or help you realize your vocation.)

Open response:

6. Please use 150 words to describe how great this faculty advisor/mentor is (specific examples are great, but not required):

## **Appendix C**

### ***Solicitation email to accompany student survey***

Hendrix Students,

Do you appreciate the assistance of your academic advisor or other faculty mentor? Would you like to see this professor recognized for outstanding work? Hendrix College issues the annual Carole Herrick Award for Excellence in Academic Advising. To make a nomination, **click on the link below** and fill out the short form. The **deadline is 4 p.m., Monday, February 22**. If you have questions, please contact Dr. Brett Hill at [hillb@hendrix.edu](mailto:hillb@hendrix.edu).

## **Appendix D**

### ***Letter sent to non-winning nominees***

Every year the Provost's office solicits nominations from Hendrix students for the Carole Herrick Award for Excellence in Academic Advising. This award recognizes and rewards outstanding academic advising provided by Hendrix Faculty. The Academic Advising Committee reviews these

nominations and recommends a single winner. This task is always challenging because of the difficulty of selecting a single winner from among such high-quality nominations. This particular year, though, we were more than compensated by hearing how important personal advising was to students as they navigated diverse crises.

Although your nomination ultimately was not selected for the award this year, the Academic Advising Committee thought you might like to know that you were among a small group of faculty nominated and that your efforts were praised and appreciated by your students. It was a genuine pleasure to read about how much your students value your counsel, and it is an honor to have you as a colleague.

## **Committee on Academic Appeals**

### **2020-2021 Annual Report**

**Chair: Fred Ablondi**

The Committee on Academic Appeals (CAA) heard two cases this year, both of which were appeals of Committee on Academic Integrity (CAI) decisions and involved the same exam. These appeals were forwarded to the Chair of CAA on December 22, 2020, and the decisions were made on January 14, 2021.

These appeals were made on the basis of the putative existence of new information, unavailable during the original conference, that could have affected the outcome. The committee determined that this was not the case, and that CAI was aware of the information at the time of the conference. The appeals were thus denied.

## **Committee on Academic Assessment**

### **2020-2021 Annual Report**

**Chair: Mark Goadrich**

Our fall 2020 task for the Assessment Committee was to review the 2019-2020 departmental assessment reports, which can be found at <https://www.hendrix.edu/facultyresources/default.aspx?id=91176>

We met every two weeks and rotated through committee members providing feedback through a rubric to departments. This feedback was compiled and distributed to the departments through the Office of Assessment. We noted that all of the assessment reports were improving from previous years, mainly due to the hard work of the Office of Assessment for the recent Higher Learning Commission accreditation visit.

We also began discussions of how to collect indirect feedback for the Learning Domains and other programs in the Collegiate Center. We decided on language for questions that could be added in a

rotation to the student feedback forms for courses in each learning domain. This action was put on hold until a formal request to change the faculty handbook language regarding student feedback forms could be proposed.

In spring 2021, we shifted to reviewing the Collegiate Center assessment reports, which can be found at <https://www.hendrix.edu/facultyresources/default.aspx?id=91175>

Again, we met every two weeks and rotated through committee members providing feedback through a rubric to departments. This feedback was compiled and distributed to the departments through the Office of Assessment.

We also discussed the results of the Junior Meeting assessment and ways to improve the process, which was impacted by the online fall semester being virtual.

We resumed discussion of the use of student feedback to provide indirect assessment and drafted a formal faculty handbook revision proposal to this effect. This proposal was submitted to AP for review and comments and received official approval from the full faculty at the April 15, 2021, meeting.

As assessment is a continual cycle, we plan next year to once again review the assessment reports for departments and the collegiate center and make improvements to the system where necessary.

## **Committee on Academic Integrity**

### **2020-2021 Annual Report**

#### **Chair: Maxine Payne**

#### **Overview**

The committee handled 51 cases of academic integrity violations during the 2020/2021 academic year. This is a 106% increase from the 2019/2020 total of 24 cases. This year we saw more cases of cheating when the materials were being delivered to students virtually as well as when students were allowed to submit work virtually. This was especially prevalent in disciplines where internet cheating services are readily available, for example Mathematics and Computer Science. Many cases involved students cheating on exams by using internet resources. Others involved students copying the work of their peers, which had been posted online. Otherwise, there were cases of clear plagiarism, mainly from online source material.

#### **Case Processing & Outcomes**

Of these 51 cases, 2 conferences were held and the other 48 cases were resolved with Letters of Agreement. In all of the cases the chair of the committee approved the accusing faculty's recommendation for sanctions. The committee has one case that will carry over into the first two weeks of the fall semester because it came in during finals, after the student members of the committee had returned home. (50 cases resolved, 1 case pending)

## **Issues Addressed and Changes Made**

This year I emailed the members of the committee, at the beginning of both the fall and spring semester, to review all of the policies and procedures with members before cases began to come in. All of the members of the committee had a good grasp of the policies and procedures.

We are following the same procedures I developed four years ago including: the use of check sheets, completely electronic files, and collaboration with the Provost's office in maintaining the electronic data base for offenses.

We are continuing to follow the suggestions of the Associate Provost David Sutherland and the Registrar's office by assigning grades of a grade of "NR" when the committee has a case at the end of the semester.

In November we held a virtual Faculty Feedback Session to address concerns the faculty had regarding academic integrity. The overwhelming concern was the frequency of cheating and the amount of time it takes for faculty to deal with cases. Many faculty expressed that they simply couldn't report all of the incidences even though they knew they were occurring.

## **Future Work**

This year we dealt with an unprecedented amount of cheating that was specific to remote instruction. The increase in cheating is shocking and discouraging. The number of online resources available to students seems impossible for faculty to monitor and adds an incredible amount of work for them. I am confident that only a small portion of violations were actually reported as faculty were simply overwhelmed with having to prove that 85% of a class cheated on an exam. (This is what more than one of my colleagues said during a Faculty Feedback Session on November 06, 2020, and other colleagues repeated the same percentages in the spring).

Additionally, some of my colleagues have been very discouraged and insecure in reporting cases in their departments when their colleagues, especially their senior colleagues, have not reported cases. These incidences cause the junior faculty undue stress and leads to confusion for the students, who are aware of the incidences and do not understand why some students "get away with it."

It is important to periodically update the faculty about the work of the committee, especially as it relates to information that they can use to avoid academic integrity violations from occurring. It is still the committee's opinion that, in some cases, a student doesn't understand that what they have done is a violation of academic integrity. This became very obvious in disciplines where some online resources are allowed and others are forbidden. Even in instances where faculty were explicit in what was allowed, students found sources that weren't mentioned specifically and claimed ignorance. Again, it is impossible for faculty to keep up with all of the resources being posted online to aid in student cheating. The more examples we can share with the faculty of the ways in which students may violate the academic integrity policies at Hendrix, the more we can prevent violations from occurring in the future.

It remains important that the Chair of the Committee on Academic Integrity vet the upcoming student members. I have communicated with David Sutherland and he has forwarded the names of students who have been recommended for assignment to the committee.

Amanda Pizzo is an asset to the work of the committee. She is efficient with distributing penalty letters, maintaining the spreadsheet of violations, and archiving the files for the Provost's office. Amanda has also helped me keep the forms updated online, which has been a problem in the past.

Changes in policies and procedures were postponed this year simply because of all of the distractions and difficulties teaching during the pandemic presented. There are several issues that I believe need to be addressed.

- 1) We need to address how Appeals are handled and the confusion about whether or not, in cases of Academic Integrity Appeals, the Appeals committee can be by-passed and decisions can be made exclusively by the Provost. Also, we need to clarify what happens when a student signs a Letter of Agreement with a faculty member, and then, once the parents are involved, wants to appeal. This semester two cases were brought back to the CAI by the Provost for a conference rather than going to the Academic Appeals Committee. The students and their parents communicated to me they believed they were going through an appeals process. We need clear direction for avoiding this and the committee needs a clear reason why/when cases would be kicked back to them.
- 2) There are several companies that require a letter from and administrator of the college to investigate whether or not a student has utilized its service. It would help the faculty if we had a form letter, accessible online, with the Provost's signature, that faculty could simply use without having to take the Provost's time for each individual inquiry. I will propose to the Provost that we create this form this summer and make it available to the faculty for the fall semester.
- 3) I would also propose the Penalty Letter not be sent to parents. It is when parents receive the Penalty Letter that students who have signed a Letter of Agreement change their minds. If the only difference in a minor and major violation is at the faculty members discretion (intentionality vs. ignorance), why do the two letters go to such different groups of people? This is an issue between the college and a student. If a student chooses to share the information with their parent, it should be up to them. Parents do not need to be involved in this process. They certainly do not need to believe they can attend conferences. Parents should never be allowed to attend conferences. Parents should never be allowed to interrogate classroom teachers or any member of the Committee on Academic Integrity.

## **College Conduct Council 2020-2021 Annual Report Chair: Cathy Jellenik**

The College Conduct Council had no cause to meet this for the Academic Year 2020-2021, and thus did not meet.

## Committee on Committees 2020-2021 Annual Report Chair: David Sutherland

In March the Committee conducted the elections to the Council on Academic Policy and the Committee on Committees with the results listed below. There were 65 ballots for the Council on Academic Policy and 65 ballots for the Committee on Committees.

- Elected to the Council on Academic Policy for three-year terms were Laura MacDonald and Robert Williamson. Elected as a one-year leave replacement for Courtney Hatch was Mark Goadrich. Elected as a one-year leave replacement for Robert Williamson was Anne Goldberg. Therefore, the elected faculty on the Council for Fall 2021-22 will be Lindsay Kennedy, Kiril Kolev, Mark Goadrich, Sasha Pfau, Laura McDonald, and Anne Goldberg.
- Elected to the Committee on Committees for two year-terms were Jennifer Peszka and Todd Tinsley. Elected as a leave replacement for Kristi McKim in the spring was Toni Jaudon. Therefore, the elected members of the Committee on Committees for Fall 2021-22 will be Todd Berryman, Kristi McKim, Jennifer Peszka, and Todd Tinsley.

At the April faculty meeting the faculty approved the Committee's nominations for membership on standing committees for 2021–22. In making its recommendations the Committee took into account the full range of faculty responsibilities including ex officio memberships, department or program chair/director appointments, and service on the Council of New Student Advisors, program boards, task forces, and ad hoc committees. The Committee did not assign faculty members who will be on sabbatical leave during part or all of the year. New faculty members for 2021-22 were also excluded from assignment. The Committee on Enrollment and Financial Aid is no longer an active standing committee because of overlap with the College's FARE program.

**Standing Committees Faculty Membership for 2021-22** (excluding ex officio and student members).

Academic Advising: Gantz (chair), Morgan, Shanks

Academic Appeals: Ablondi (chair), Lopas, Moran

Academic Assessment: Downes (chair), Rauh, Schneider, Vernon

Academic Integrity: Fabricio, Hanlon, Payne (chair), Scott C.

College Conduct Council: Bergfeld (chair), Cottrant-Estell, Miller, Murray R.

Curriculum: Gunderson J, Haden Chomphosy (chair), Hales, Rogers, Weddle

Diversity and Dialogue: Glick, Jaudon (chair), Sprunger

Engaged Learning: Gunderson W, Liu, Schurko (chair), Skok

Honorary Degrees: Caro, Muse (chair), Scott R

Honors: Murphy (chair), Resinski, Whelan

International/Intercultural: Campolo (chair), Vilahomat

Student Life: French, Horne, Looney, McClung

Human Subjects Review Board: Dearolf, Dow, Gorvine

**Other Actions:** The Committee also proposed changes in the selection policies for the Faculty Board of Trustees Representative. Those changes are now part of the Faculty Handbook.

**Committee on Curriculum  
2020-2021 Annual Report  
Chair: William Haden Chomphosy**

**Frequency of Meetings:**

The Curriculum Committee met 8 times during the 2020-2021 academic year. Meetings were typically held on Tuesdays from 4:10-5:00 p.m. with some variations in the Spring 2021 semester. Exact dates for meetings include: 10/6/20, 11/3/20, 11/10/20, 11/17/20, 11/24/20, 12/1/20, 12/8/20, 2/10/21.

**Curriculum Changes:**

Courses followed by “\*” indicate fast-track approval by unanimous agreement of the Chair, the Registrar, and the Associate Provost.

The following courses were added to the catalog:

Course	Summary	Collegiate Center Codes
ANTH/SOCI 365	Theory course highlighting the overlap between the Anthropology and Sociology fields.	SB
ARTS 241/341	Sequence of drawing courses that focuses on using digital tools, such as smart tablets.	EA
BCMB 497	Course that bears credit for senior seminar.	
BIOL 155	A second introductory biology course with a focus on evolution and biodiversity.	NS-L
BIOL 255	Course focusing on ecology.	
BIOL 270	Course focusing on developing writing skills appropriate for biology.	W2
BIOL 352	Course focusing on invertebrate zoology.	
BIOL 353	Course focusing on vertebrate zoology.	
BIOL 496	Course that bears credit for biological research.	
TART 350	Course focusing on the role of women in playwriting.	HP

The following existing courses were removed from the catalog:

PHIL 255*	PHIL 315*	PHIL 355*				
-----------	-----------	-----------	--	--	--	--

The following courses were renumbered or retitled:

Original course code	Modification
BIOL 150	Changed title to “Fundamentals of Cellular Life”
CSCI 382*	Changed title to “Algorithms”
ENGF 385*	Changed title to “Literary Theory: Black feminism/after slavery”
MUSA 425*	Changed title to “Form and Analysis”
PSYCH 341*	Changed title to “Psychology of Morality”
TART 140*	Changed title to “Acting Fundamentals”
TART 145*	Changed title to “Design Fundamentals”



The following courses added or removed Collegiate Center codes:

Course	Modification
BIOL 270*	The new course was approved for W2 credit.
HIST 230*	Drop VA

The following courses added or removed Odyssey Credit codes:

Course	Modification
POLI 283*	Changed Odyssey Coding from PL to SP (approved by Committee on Engaged Learning)

The following courses added or removed prerequisites:

Course	Modification
BIOL 330	Changed prerequisite course to BIOL 155 to align with new major.
BIOL 370	Added prerequisite of BIOL 155.
CHEM 320	Changed prerequisite course from MATH 140 to MATH 130.
POLI 326*	Removed prerequisite courses.
PHYS 430	Changed pre-requisite PHYS 315/CHEM 310 to PHYS 305 corequisite.

The following courses had revisions to their catalog copy:

CHEM 100*	ENGF 385*	MUSA 425*	PSYC 243	PSYCH 341*	SOCI 380*	
--------------	--------------	--------------	----------	---------------	-----------	--

The following major and minor were eliminated:

Philosophy & Religion
-----------------------

The following majors were revised:

Major	Modification
Biochemistry/Molecular Biology	Removes MATH 140 from major.
Biology	Removes the following items from the list of required courses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CHEM 120, BIOL 190, BIOL 220, and BIOL 260</li> </ul> Adds the following items as required courses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BIOL 155, BIOL 255, BIOL 270</li> </ul> Reduces the number of required 300/400-level electives from four to three.
Interdisciplinary Studies	Major catalog copy has been updated to clarify the process, feature specific learning goals, and formalize guidance toward methodology and W2 courses in proposals.
Sociology/Anthropology	Removes the following items from the list of required courses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SOCI 210 and SOCI 365</li> </ul> Adds the following items as required courses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any statistics course (BUSI 250, MATH 215, PSYC 290, SOCI 210) and ANTH SOCI 365</li> </ul> Adds a list of courses from outside the department that can be used in progress toward either the ANTH or SOCI major.

The following minors were revised:

<b>Minor</b>	<b>Modification</b>
CHIN	Removes the following items from the list of required courses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• CHIN 220, CHIN 310, CHIN 320</li></ul> Adds a list of courses that focus on Chinese language and/or Chinese culture.

### **Rejected proposal:**

The Economics & Business department brought forward a proposal for a new minor in Management. The proposal was rejected by the Committee on Curriculum in our meeting on 12/1 due to concerns that the new minor was not very different from existing minors offered by the department and concerns about how it might be compared to programs at other schools. The department chose to withdraw the proposal following the Committee's decision.

### **Future goals:**

- The learning goals for the Learning Domains will be a focus point of the Fall Campus Conference. We are working with the Provost's office and the Assessment team to coordinate a workshop.
- The revised forms continue to work well but could the process of getting forms from the proposer through all the appropriate channels/signatures could be streamlined. We will attempt setting up the Microsoft Flow ahead of the fall semester.

### **EA Assessment:**

The Expressive Arts Learning Domain was chosen for assessment in the 2020-2021 academic year. Megan Leonard and Sasha Pfau have been working with Mark Goadrich to develop a novel tool for eliciting direct assessment information from professors teaching a course coded with a Learning Domain. The tool was distributed to all professors/instructors who taught a course coded with the EA Learning Domain on May 26, 2021. The data and analysis will be presented upon collection and analysis.

## **Committee on Diversity and Dialogue**

### **2020-2021 Annual Report**

#### **Chair: Toni Jaudon**

Despite the difficulties of remote learning, the Committee on Diversity and Dialogue undertook several successful initiatives during the 2020-21 academic year. Of particular note is the uncompensated labor this Committee's members provided to the College during Summer 2020. While standing committees do not work during the summer (as faculty are not technically employed by the College during June and July), Committee members generously gave significant time and labor to meetings and activities during this period to promote diversity and inclusion and to help the College respond to current events.

This year, the Committee on Diversity and Dialogue undertook multiple initiatives:

- Summer book group: During the Summer of 2020, Committee members prepared, advertised, administered, and led book discussion groups on Ijeoma Oluo's *So You Want to Talk About Race*; 53 faculty and staff members participated. This service is particularly noteworthy, as many of those involved were "off contract" (the discussions and planning took place during June and July).
- Required diversity trainings for faculty and staff: During Summer and Fall 2020, Committee members assisted the Office of Diversity and Inclusion throughout the process of implementing these trainings. Committee members offered feedback on required training modules, gathered written resources to distribute to the community, crafted a detailed guide for facilitators, and helped lead small-group discussions.
- Informal conversations for faculty and staff: In Fall 2020 and Spring 2021, Committee members planned and facilitated informal conversations on diversity, equity and inclusion issues for faculty and staff.
- Campus events: Committee members hosted diversity- and inclusion-related events in partnership with other campus discussion spaces, including the Pericles forum (2 sessions in Spring 2021), Disability Awareness Club (session in Spring 2021) and Real Talk Mondays (2 sessions, Fall 2020 and Spring 2021).
- Providing resources to faculty and staff on diversity issues: Committee members provided written educational resources for faculty and staff in response to current events (e.g., the January 6 insurrection and the March 2021 hate crimes against Asian American women).
- Awarding the Dionne Jackson Prize for Diversity and Inclusion: The Committee facilitated the campus's selection of this year's Jackson prize winner, and also proposed revisions to the selection process for next year to clarify eligibility (awaiting decision on these revisions from CoF).

The Committee met or hosted activities on the following dates via Teams (additional work completed by email): 6/11/20, 7/2/20, 7/17/20 (meeting of facilitators for faculty/student book group), week of 7/20/20: facilitated 5 book groups, 8/26/20, 9/16/20, 10/15/20 (facilitated faculty diversity trainings), 10/21/20 (informal conversation for faculty and staff), 11/5/20 (fall report to the community on diversity issues), 2/2/21, 3/4/21 (informal conversation for faculty and staff), 4/7/21, 4/22/21 (spring report to the community on diversity issues), 4/28/21 (informal conversation for faculty and staff)

Future goals: These are issues we expect to address in the coming months:

- Continued work to support the Office of Diversity and Inclusion's progress on the issues outlined in the Demand.Action.Change document
- Continued support for mandatory diversity training
- Continued support for faculty and staff conversation and development on issues of diversity, inclusion, and equity

These goals will sharpen in early fall 2021, when the newly constituted Committee for the 2021-22 AY will meet.

## **Committee on Engaged Learning 2020-2021 Annual Report**

## Chair: Andrew Schurko

### 1. Non-coding and non-funding activities:

**Evaluating Odyssey requirements for graduating seniors during COVID-19 pandemic:** We addressed the issue for graduating seniors who might be short Odyssey credits due to limitations imposed by the pandemic. CEL initially proposed establishing a new, temporary Odyssey category called Contemporary World Challenges (CWC) that would allow students to propose projects only when the College is teaching fully remote. Such CWC projects would still require a second traditional Odyssey category, but would require a more substantial reflection plan for future action. However, this plan was not favorably received by the Council on Academic Policy (AP). In particular, there was concern that creating an additional category was complicating, rather than simplifying, Odyssey. CEL subsequently agreed that it was best to extend the temporary completion measure (adopted in March 2020), which suggest alternatives to official public presentations or performances and allow modification of various hours requirements and their replacement with supplementary activities. In addition, a request was put out to faculty and staff to provide ideas for possible Odyssey projects that could be posted to the Odyssey website.

**Consideration for fall funding requests for projects already in progress:** In the October funding cycle, a few students inquired about applying for Odyssey funding for internships and other opportunities were either already in progress or were planned to take place during the semester. Traditionally, such proposals were not considered. However, CEL determined that due to the restrictions imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic, such exceptions would be made on a case-by-case basis during the academic year, with the goal of providing more opportunities for funding and new projects.

**Student evaluation and assessment questions:** CEL approved the plan to include a standard student evaluation question to every Odyssey-coded course for assessment purposes.

**Mileposts policy:** CEL also approved this policy that would guide students towards finishing the Odyssey graduation requirement and would go in the catalog. Specifically, this policy strongly suggests that student complete at least one Odyssey experience by the time they register for classes for junior year, and that by the end of junior year they have completed at least two categories.

**Faculty survey:** With the Odyssey Office in the process of re-thinking the learning goals for the Odyssey Program, CEL edited and approved the draft of a survey to assess faculty views on engaged learning and the current and future learning goals of the program. This survey would be sent out to faculty and staff who supervise projects.

**Policy changes for future funding cycles (allowing summer PL and UR requests in the April cycle).** The Odyssey guide states that the April 1 funding cycle is for “... *fall semester and winter break projects, along with some summer PL experiences.*” The summer PL experiences traditionally considered are for cases where students had not heard back by February 1 about their summer positions. However, in the April cycle, there were a few “UR-like projects” that were submitted as PL to take advantage of this “qualifying summer experience” loophole for PL. This led to CEL having a discussion about making changes to the funding cycles, which would accept PL and UR proposals in both the February and April cycles. CEL agreed that for future years, students who have plans finalized by

February 1 are encourage to apply for funding in the February cycle. The April funding cycle would now be open to projects that would be carried out during the summer, fall or winter. However, if a summer experience proposal were rejected in the February cycle, it can only be re-submitted in April after substantial changes to the plans or quality of the proposal.

**Funding for paid experiences:** CEL also discussed whether to award funding to students who hold paid internships or professional field experiences, or whether to provide funds/stipends to help students deal with costs in cases where they are not paid from their positions until later in the summer (similar to a “salary advance”). CEL agreed that additional funding for paid experiences or a “salary advance” situation were not an appropriate use of funds and were not considered for funding.

## 2. Odyssey coding requests

CEL approved coding requests for the following proposals:

- POLI 235: Public Policy: Special projects module
- Museum Associates and Gallery Educators: Professional and Leadership Development (preapproved activity)
- Campus Kitty General Committee: Service to the World (pre-approved activity)
- Narrative Medicine Reading/Writing Group: Artistic Creativity (pre-approved activity)
- POLI 283: Model United Nations: Special Projects (permanent coding)
- POLI 383: Model United Nations mentoring: Special Projects (permanent coding)
- Windstream Finance & Accounting Leadership Program: Undergraduate Research (Pre-approved activity)
- POLI 290: Topics in American Politics: Policy and Program Design: Global Awareness (one-time coding)
- BIOL 335: Marin Biology: Global Awareness module

CEL declined coding requests for the following proposals:

- ARTS 241: Intermediate Drawing – Working Digitally: Artistic Creativity
- Mental Health Committee Chair: Professional and Leadership Development (pre-approved activity)
- TART 335: Meisner Technique: Artistic Creativity

**Special cases of Odyssey coding requests:** PHIL 206: Ethics in the Face of Poverty: This course had previously been coded SW as a pre-approved activity. However, CEL approved the request to change this to a module, meaning that it is an optional requirement and students can still pass the course with a grade of C or higher without completing the SW requirements. CEL also approved the request that asked for a reduction to 24 hours of service work. The rationale was that due to the pandemic, it might be challenging of students to complete the required 30 hour minimum of service work, and a module would make this optional and reduce the stress on students and the instructor to complete the service requirement to receive a grade of C or higher.

## 3. Summary of Odyssey funding requests

Below is a summary of the number of proposals and funding outcomes for each cycle.  
Cycle # Proposals Funds. Project details can be found on the Odyssey web pages.

Cycle	# Proposals	Funds requested	# Proposals funded	Amount funded	#Faculty / Staff proposals funded	# Student proposals funded
Oct. 2020	12	\$26,681	10	\$14,195	5	5
Feb. 2021	14	\$60,482	13	\$60,282	3	10
April 2021	19	\$68,274	16	\$55,981	3	13

**Request to modify budget for previously funded proposal:** Funding for the “Paris Residency 2021” project was approved in the October funding cycle, with travel planned for May 2021. However, due to COVID-19 restrictions, travel would be delayed until a later time. This led to an increase in lodging costs, and in April, CEL made an exception for this out-of-cycle request and approved an additional \$500 for the travel budget.

## **Committee on Honorary Degrees 2020-2021 Annual Report Chair: Ann Muse**

In spring or fall 2020, there were no ceremonies to honor the 2019 recipient due to Covid-19 restrictions. I contacted President Arnold in the spring of 2020 concerning another call for nominations for the year 2020-21. He encouraged me to send the call for nominations to the community, noting that having nominations for the future is productive.

I sent the typical email to Hendrix community, requested Donna Plemmons send it to the Board of Trustees, and requested Pamela Owen send it to the alumni. There were no nominations submitted. As a result of nil response, the committee did not meet in 2020-21. I am hopeful that the email call for nominations sent in 2021 will garner nominations from our community.

## **Committee on Honors 2020-2021 Annual Report Chair: Britt Anne Murphy**

This was Dr. Falls-Corbitt’s final year as Director of Distinguished Scholarships, and it was a challenging one with faculty, staff, and students working remotely in the fall, and many remaining remote in the spring. Dr. Falls-Corbitt continued her recruitment of Hendrix students for distinguished scholarships, and supported faculty and staff liaisons for these distinguished awards in an online environment, beginning with a writing workshop in the fall and ending with a writing workshop for rising seniors in the spring. Throughout the year we kept at the forefront of our recruitment and mentoring the needs of first-generation college students and students of color. Dr. Falls-Corbitt had access to Mellon funds through Faculty Development to increase diversity in our pedagogy at Hendrix, including enhancing access to distinguished scholarships for our minority and

1<sup>st</sup> Gen students. The final meeting of the year on May 5 was dedicated to this topic, and we invited Kesha Baoua and Terri Tran from ODI to take part in our brainstorming and discussion.

Dr. Falls-Corbitt was in regular contact with liaisons throughout the year to offer them support for their work. She maintained a master list of scholarships that Hendrix supports, which went to the liaisons and potential student applicants as needed. A timeline emerged of how the advising especially for the writing portion of awards unfolds:

August - October: Watson, Fulbright, Knight-Hennessy, Schwarzman

November - January: Goldwater, Soros

December - February: Truman, Udall

February - April: Recruitment season opens

Dr. Falls-Corbitt, members of the Honors Committee, and guests Allison Shutt and Writing Center Director Felipe Pruneda-Senties sponsored an online day-long workshop early in the semester on Saturday, August 22 for seniors who had been working on drafts for particular scholarship applications over the summer. Sixteen students attended, and the day allowed liaisons to meet with students, and one-on-one sessions with faculty and staff to review essays, as well as time for students to pair up and give feedback to each other.

The Scholarships Tea converted to an online format and was held Thursday, March 4 during the convocation period. The session was geared towards a more selective group (the top 5% or so) of promising juniors who have interest in applying for the British Awards. Dr. Kristi McKim, liaison to the Rhodes, Marshall, and Mitchell awards, prepared a presentation for the twelve juniors who attended, and of those, three completed applications to be interviewed. The interviews, which we conducted later in March, are now the first step in applying for the British awards, and a part of a new procedure for us to gauge interest and willingness to take on the challenging process of applying for these competitive awards.

On Saturday, April 24, Dr. Pat Hoy, former director of the writing program at NYU and consultant to the English Department at Hendrix College, led a half-day Zoom workshop, "Writing the Personal Essay." Dr. Dorian Stuber, the next Director of Distinguished Scholarships, also attended to connect with the fourteen rising seniors who were there. This summer there will be no personal statement writing workshops offered, but Dr. Stuber will be available to assist students with their essay development.

This year was a success for many categories of awards in which we mentored students, in that we got several students to the second round of competition and many won awards, despite the online nature of application processes and mentoring. Even better, our students expressed appreciation and growth in the process of applying, and used what they learned to make informed decisions on future opportunities. We were deliberate in diversifying our applicant pool, and overall were pleased to see strong minority and first-generation college representation among our scholarship competitors this year.

We had one applicant for the Knight-Hennessy Scholarship (for graduate study at Stanford University) who was unsuccessful - Innocent Nsabimana. We also had two applicants for the Soros Fellowship for New Americans, Amy Cabrera and Gifty Agana, who were ultimately unsuccessful. Our Elie Wiesel Essay applicant, Keegan Vacanti, made it into the second round of reviews, but did not advance into the final round.

We had some hard-won success with the Fulbright this year. Daniel Whelan prepared four students for Fulbright Teaching Assistantships and two for the Fulbright Study/Research Award. The ETA applicants were Morgan Akers, Katie McNamara, MiKayla (Mak) Millard, and Kailey Miller; the Study Award applicants were Olivia Kelley, Elizabeth Jones, Rebecca Parham, and Aubrey Wasden. Mak Millard and Elizabeth Jones progressed to the finalist stage, and ultimately, Elizabeth Jones was successful in winning an award to study at Royal Holloway, University of London, where there is a robust program in Holocaust Studies. Dr. Whelan has been steadily improving our preparation and interview processes for the Fulbright. He continued to focus on more deliberate and earlier use of faculty with relevant country expertise in the interview process. Dr. Whelan also has set more rigorous requirements for the application process, to encourage potential applicants to reach a better understanding of their host country earlier in their writing process.

We also had a Watson winner. The Committee selected four Watson candidates from an initial applicant pool of seven. The four candidates (Brittany Chue, Peyton Hall, Mallory Magruder, and Savannah Wiegel) were selected entirely through an online application and interview process, were mentored online, and submitted their materials online by the November 2 deadline. With help from a few committee members and other helpers, I coached the Watson candidates for their interviews with Watson Fellowship Program Associate Director Sneha Subramanian, which took place on Zoom November 19 and 20. On March 15, we found out that Savannah Wiegel had won a Watson for her project *Healing Words: Building Community Health through Narrative Medicine* to be carried out in Ireland, Switzerland, Japan, Guatemala, and Argentina. In April I held an informational meeting for all underclassmen on Teams with guest Nathan Thomas, a Watson winner from 2010, and Savannah Wiegel attending to inform and infuse energy into next year's recruits.

This year was disappointing for the Goldwater with none awarded or receiving honorary mention. Goldwater liaison Jenn Dearolf worked with nominees Ashton Bell, Cole Bolen, Jeremy Choh, and Mayra Valazquez.

## **Committee on International and Intercultural Studies**

### **2020-2021 Annual Report**

#### **Chair: Chris Campolo**

The committee reviewed applications and approved approximately 47 students for study abroad. We awarded prizes to seniors who had made outstanding achievements in these areas. We met twice and did a lot of business by email.

We also awarded the following prizes:

The Betty F. Bumpers International Leadership and Fellowship Award is given to student(s) who, during their final year at the college, have made the most significant contributions to international activities, concerns, and understanding within the Hendrix College community. There is normally a monetary stipend attached to this award.



The Dr. Inis L. Claude, Jr. International Studies Achievement Award is given to the graduating senior whose overall record in international studies courses both here on campus (e.g., in foreign languages, culture studies and other related disciplines of the College) and in overseas studies programs reflects the highest level of academic achievement. This award is generally accompanied by a book in the recipient's discipline.)

## **Committee on Student Life**

### **2020-2021 Annual Report**

#### **Chair: Stan Rauh**

The committee experienced a reduced role this academic year as a result of the remote learning environment in Fall, followed by the hybrid model in Spring stemming from COVID-19 protocols. The committee met once per semester to ensure that student organizations could be approved as normal, to review student experiences during the pandemic, and to introduce potential issues that may face the committee in the next academic year.

#### Constitutions for New Student Organizations

As expected due to COVID-19, the committee received a limited number of constitutions to review. The approved organizations for this year include: Economics Club, NAACP, Military Support Group, Dungeons and Dragons Club, the revival of the Pre-Health Society, and a small alteration to the African Students Club. Two issues regarding approval continue to appear in discussions: how organizations deal with outside fundraising for their own purposes, and whether there are ethical issues to address when student groups desire to financially contribute to outside organizations. A broader policy discussion on these issues may prove useful.

#### Future Goals – Campus Safety

Students have expressed concern over public safety after a few significant incidents occurred on campus during Spring semester. Communication between students and P-Safe appears to be one area where improvement would be useful, including better education for students on safety precautions and establishing the trust necessary for students to take advantage of the Safe Ride program. Campus lighting may also need some improvement as per the Dean's annual Light Walk, while decisions will need to be made on the Blue Light system's continuation on campus.

## **Human Subjects Review Board**

### **2020-2021 Annual Report**

#### **Chairs: Stacey Schwartzkopf and Carmen Merrick**

We reviewed 16 proposals in Fall 2020. Of these 16, 1 was full board, 3 were expedited, and 12 of which were exempt. In the Spring of 2021, we had 9 proposals, 4 of which were full board, 2 of which were expedited, and 3 of which were exempt. Between the two of us as co-chairs, we also conducted a few consultations for Odyssey each semester, which involved meeting with students to

determine if their project required HSRB review. The committee also had an hour-long training session in Fall 2020. Here is the departmental breakdown of our 25 applications (note that some proposals came from multiple departments):

Sociology/Anthropology: 11

Politics: 6

Psychology: 5

Music: 2

Biology: 1

History: 1

Religious Studies: 1