

Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee
Minutes - 10/11/18

Present (voting): Wendy Cook, Janet Finke, Jackie Krause, Dan Lipori, Megan Matheson, Josh Welsh

Present (non-voting): Lindsey Brown, Eric Foch, Gail Mackin, Julia Stringfellow

Absent (voting): Ke Zhong

Absent (non-voting): none

Guests: Claire-Anne Grepo, Walter Szelega

The meeting was called to order at 3:31 p.m. Minutes of September 27, 2018 were approved as written. Janet will remind Tim to look into getting a COTS rep.

Chair updates

Changes to the undergraduate admissions policy and procedure passed Faculty Senate at the October 3 meeting. It is now on the agenda for Provost Council on October 16. If approved, it will go to UPAC in winter quarter.

Old Business

a. Possible change to meeting day/time

Two Doodle polls were sent out last week. The results showed there is no good time that works for everyone. The biggest issue is that Curriculum Committee will be meeting every week during winter quarter, and potentially at times throughout the fall and spring quarters, too. Gail solved one potential conflict with by having Bernadette attend Curriculum Committee meetings in her place, but there are still conflicts for EC and for the Faculty Senate chair. Walter will talk to Amy to find out if there is anything that might work better.

It appears the conflict with Curriculum Committee's meeting time may become an ongoing issue. In that case, the question of a different meeting time for AAC would be better posed next year. Any changes need to be made a year in advance so people have enough warning and enough time to plan their teaching schedules. However, no one knows what will happen next year Curriculum Committee's meetings due to the pending Gen Ed implementation.

Jackie moved to revisit this issue during the last meeting of fall quarter. Motion was seconded and approved.

b. Foreign language requirements for Post-Bacc, AS-T, and Out-of-State AS degree students

Lindsey has received questions from advisors regarding post-bacc students, AS-transfer students, and out-of-state transfer students, as well as students who complete Gen Ed requirements at another in-state university. Some confusion surrounds the requirements for these students because there are gaps in policy.

Megan indicated in 5-90-050(3)H, Native America and ASL should be for college foreign language. If they are listed as being acceptable for high school foreign language, then that should also apply to college.

Lindsey has been working on some draft language to address the issues that are continuously arising, and will bring the drafts to the next meeting.

New Business

a. Reorganization Policy

AAC worked on this policy at different times over the last few years. Walter provided some brief background on the new policy language. Last year the policy was given to BFCC so they could work on putting it into code language. BFCC's changes were approved at Faculty Senate meeting toward the end of last year, and EC made some additional clerical changes over the summer. Recently the president sent the language back without explicit instructions as to what to do with it.

There is debate over whether this language should be housed in policy or in the code. EC would like AAC to review the new policy language. The code changes will be going forward to the BOT at the October meeting, but this policy language will also be going forward. These documents were supposed to be presented at the summer BOT meeting but were pulled at the last minute. Gail indicated the code language and the policy language are very different from each other. This is something Amy has been working on with the provost in the interest of shared governance.

Concerns arose surrounding the new policy language. The policy is for reorganization of colleges, schools, and departments, but 1.1 specifically discusses things that are not colleges, schools, or departments. This is confusing. Gail indicated this language is intended to clarify things that aren't otherwise covered. It is basically saying that faculty, other departments, etc., should have input into ASL things, such as name changes, which affect academic units.

Multiple committee members felt the new language seemed vague. Dan questioned language stating proposals will come from within Academic and Student Life. Use of the word "typically" caused additional confusion. Gail explained that the colleges are part of ASL; the purpose of that sentence is to identify the division in which this policy belongs. For example, it is not in Public Affairs or Enrollment Management. ASL is over about 75% of the university. However, if someone brings a proposal forward, it still has to go through their department chair or dean.

Josh questioned language in 1.1. If the purpose of this section is to include departments that are not part of academic departments, shouldn't those departments be included in the review sequences? Megan indicated the language appears to be laying out a very formal procedure for academic departments but leaving it vague for the non-academic departments.

Dan discussed the previous issues regarding where a policy like this would be housed. Some of the new language appears to hint at that. Previously, administration felt the policy should be housed with them so it would be easier for them to suggest or make changes. Some of

the new language seems to address that by saying that anyone can make changes. Gail indicated that, according to 5-90-010(2), the policy would belong here with AAC.

Janet suggested there is some strength to the proposal in that it provides a voice in the process, and people are able to express their opinions and vote. However, some areas are less clear, specifically the meaning of and intention for 1.1. Clarifying language is needed. There does not appear to be any mention of impact on students; that should be in 4. Also, the final decision should be listed in a separate item so it is clear and not buried under the final approval process. Dan indicated it would be helpful to see this new policy language in comparison with the BFCC language in order to identify similarities and differences. Questions still exist as to why the new policy language does not have a number associated with it.

No decisions were made at this time.

b. Commencement policy change affecting students graduating fall quarter (Charge 18-19.12)

Claire-Anne Grepo, ASCWU VP, attended to share information about students graduating during fall quarter. Current policy requires these students must wait until spring to walk. This affects many students in the education department, but it affects students in other disciplines as well. Claire-Anne shared a packet of student testimonies. Students are not happy about the graduation policies because they've gone to school with the same group for four years and then learn they can't graduate with their same class. Some students overload on credits to graduate in time; others aren't aware it's a policy until they reach their junior or senior year. Many students already have jobs lined up by spring quarter, so we are potentially losing a group of alumni because of this policy.

Claire-Anne called EWU to find out about their policies, and they don't have anything as strict as we do. Lindsey looked up Eastern, and their summer policy is very similar to ours, but may not be as stringent. A few years ago the Registrar's office surveyed students in the commencement ceremony, and students didn't want to have a December ceremony.

Janet indicated it sounds like the education students are primarily being affected. Claire-Anne has been trying to talk to other students but is mostly aware of education students. It seems like there could be a waiver, or something similar, for students who are in an internship or student teaching. Claire-Anne recently met with the provost to discuss the issue and learned that opening it up to education students could lead to opening it up to everyone.

There are potential issues that could arise from making changes or allowing restrictions within the policy. Student teaching is 16 credits but is technically one course. That is something to consider. We could specify a certain number of credits, or one course, or specify that students may walk in spring but must finish all requirements by fall. However, student teaching can't be done over the summer. Claire-Anne surveyed students, and 54% were planning to do their student teaching in fall after graduation; students who don't do this tend to cram in a lot of credits.

Lindsey indicated that making changes would create issues for honors. Summer graduates

don't have honors listed in the commencement book because they are two quarters out. Fall would also cause this to happen, but would move it to three quarters out. The Registrar's office can look into what other institutions in the state are doing. Education is one of our larger majors but Lindsey was unsure of the exact number of education students graduating in fall. Janet can look at number of exact number of education majors who are student teaching in fall.

c. Placement testing prior to orientation (Charge 18-19.03)

Megan indicated a group will be meeting tomorrow. Gail drafted some language and will be meeting with Aaron Brown, Jenna Hyatt, and someone from advising. They will be getting together tomorrow to discuss the draft.

Meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m.

Next Meeting:
Oct. 25, 2018
Barge 304