

Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee
Minutes—Nov. 29, 2018

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

Present (non-voting): Eric Foch, Julia Stringfellow

Absent (voting): Ke Zhong

Absent (non-voting): Lindsey Brown, Gail Mackin

Guests: Tim Englund

Meeting was called to order at 3:33 p.m. Minutes of November 8, 2018 were approved as amended.

Chair updates

Four AAC policies were approved at the Faculty Senate meeting on November 28. Approved were the catalog year policy; the change to foreign language for post-bacc and transfer students; the commencement participation policy; and the policy addressing assessment activities. The assessment activities policy did have a caveat, which will be discussed later at today's meeting. All of the approved policies will go forward to Provost Council.

Old Business

a. Discussion of new meeting day/time for 2019-20 academic year

Second and fourth Tuesday afternoons were identified as a change that could potentially work at some point in the future, depending on the committee make-up at that time. However, Tuesday is problematic for current committee members who have department meetings on Tuesday afternoons.

The current meeting day and time appears to be best, and changing it would be problematic. If a change is mandated, then the committee could potentially lose some members because many people would not be able to attend at a different time.

Eric will report to EC that the current time works well and a better time cannot be identified.

New Business

Eric reported that any new charges need to be submitted to EC rather than coming directly to AAC. This will make it possible for EC to review and prioritize the charges and fit them into the agenda. The two new charges for discussion today are exceptions.

a. New charges from Executive Committee

AAC 18-19.16: Review CWUP 5-90-040 (36) and consider revising to allow for alternate forms of assessment outside of the regular two-hour blocks (e.g., individual/group oral exams

scheduled throughout the week).

This charge is based on a faculty issue raised during the May 30, 2018 Faculty Senate meeting. The registrar's office will work with faculty to remove the official exam time to allow for this already, but technically that is violating policy. Also, there are problems with moving the 10-minute passing period between finals, particularly because some faculty will need to administer exams out of the assigned block of time. EC wants to ensure flexibility with the policy.

Dan indicated this charge came from a potential revision to the final exam schedule, which recently was to Faculty Senate for feedback. Some classes have standardized exams that require a two-hour block of time. One possibility might be to consider having a half-hour passing period between exam blocks.

AAC 18-19.17 - Consider a revision to CWUP 5-90-040 (41) to account for transfer students without DTAs.

This is based on the concern raised on the Senate floor about this new policy only applying to first-year students. The concern came up at yesterday's Faculty Senate meeting when the initial policy language was approved.

It's possible this revision can be as easy and as straightforward as adding another bullet point to the existing policy language. Potential revisions will be addressed at the January 10 meeting. It also might be necessary to talk with some people who have experience with DTAs.

Completed charges need to be to the EC by the end of winter quarter. Julia will start looking into Charge 16.

b. Service campus concerns (Charge 18-19.05)

The intent of this charge is to develop some language that addresses how and when students declare their service campus. Fees are different depending on which campus students attend. Online students have to select the campus through which they receive most services. If online students select one of the centers, their fee structure would be different.

Wendy indicated that every center has a different MOU with its host campus at the community college. When students switch from a service campus, it affects how classes are reserved, so students do this to get around reserves. Also, the fee structure is very different for the centers than it is for Ellensburg. Until a few years ago, more services were offered at the centers. There were problems with students switching classes so they could stay with professors they liked who were at a different campus for a quarter. Wendy suggested contacting Gayla Stoner to discuss the issues addressed in this charge.

Concerns arose regarding flexibility. Students shouldn't be encountering barriers with getting into classes. Geographical issues are another concern. Jackie discussed an issue in ITAM where people who were online students were coded for the Ellensburg campus because they lived in a certain geographical area, which meant they paid higher fees. This also leads to the question of whether online students can use the rec center and other services or not. Tim

suggested identifying the services students receive for each location. These services should be as flexible as possible, but should correspond to a fees structure that will be higher or lower as students switch back and forth between campuses. Dan questioned how the fee structure is determined. Is it set by one person or by a committee? Student government votes on whether fees are implemented or not. Substantial differences must exist in the fees between campuses for this to even be an issue.

Moving forward, conversations with Gayla and Lindsey will need to be held. We will also need to find out who determines the fees.

c. Revisions to academic appeals policy/procedure (Charge 18-19.06)

The intent of this charge is to consider revisions to the appeals policy and procedure to ensure the process is not arbitrary or capricious. Additionally, distinctions may be needed to clarify grade appeals related to academics and grade appeals related to behavior, and to clarify the current roles of the Student Conduct Council and the Board of Academic Appeals/Grievance Council.

Through the current appeals process, an appeal can go through both the Student Conduct Council and through the Board of Academic Appeals, and can have different responses and outcomes from each one. Student Conduct Council, and the Board of Academic Appeals, are two separate bodies. Student Conduct Council shouldn't have to deal with grade appeals, because those are not related to a grade change. There is confusion as to how the Student Conduct Council and the Board of Academic Appeals overlap; however, part of the reason for having both committees may come from state regulations.

The appeals process contains multiple steps, which is another problem. It could be 24 weeks before a case is resolved. A student could file an appeal at the end of spring quarter, and it wouldn't be resolved until the following spring. The time window for the process needs to be shortened. Additionally, deans and department chairs tend to be reluctant to change a grade given by a faculty member unless there was truly an error. The appeals policy and procedure are not really student-centered; however, the student is the one who drives the process. If at any point the student goes to the department chair, and the chair does change the grade, faculty have no way to appeal that. Also, once students have asked for an appeal hearing, the grade in question shouldn't affect their GPA because that can affect scholarships and some types of financial aid.

Discussion will continue at the January 10 meeting. Moving forward, input will be needed from Lindsey, from Joey Bryant, and from representatives of the Student Conduct Council and the Appeals Board. Clarification is needed on the process of identifying and assigning advisors. A definition of an advisor is also needed.

d. Graduate policies

The Registrar's Office and Graduate Studies proposed some changes to existing academic policies to make the language more inclusive and applicable to graduate students, and would like the committee's input and feedback. Eric suggested sending this to EC so it can be

made into an official charge.

Janet reviewed current charges. Charge 6 will be discussed at the next meeting. Charges 10 and 11 are related and will be discussed starting in February. Julia is still working on Charge 1. Charges 8, 12, and 13 will need to be discussed. Charge 14 can't be discussed until more has been completed with Gen Ed policies and language Charge 15 is ongoing.

Meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m. Next meeting is January 10, 2019 in Barge 304. The appeals policy, and service campus concerns, will be discussed.