

*Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee  
Minutes – Jan. 25, 2018*

Present: Eric Bennett, Rodney Bransdorfer, Clem Ehoff, Janet Finke, Dan Lipori, David Martin, Megan Matheson, Ke Zhong, Lindsey Brown, Walter Szeliga  
Absent: Christos Graikos, Gail Mackin, Julia Stringfellow  
Guests: Cody Stoddard

The meeting was called to order at 3:32 p.m. Minutes of Jan. 11, 2018 were approved as amended to correct a typo.

*Chair Updates*

Dan reported that Tim Englund is no longer on AAC. Associate Provost Gail Mackin will be the new provost representative but she is out of the office today.

Walter briefly discussed a request for AAC to talk with Jim Bisgard, chair of Evaluation & Assessment Committee, about drafting a policy to address professors offering students extra credit for completing SEOIs. Also, Kandee Cleary can attend the Feb. 8 AAC meeting to talk about the diversity statement for the syllabi policy.

*Old Business*

a. Review changes to Class Attendance Policy & Procedure (CWUP 5-90-040(34) & CWUR 2-90-040(34))

Walter expressed concern about (B) because there are courses on campus that members of the public are invited to, and these courses are endorsed by the president. Astronomy star parties are one example but there are some other courses in the sciences. Community members are invited to attend and audit the course. They can come to the entire course for the whole quarter if they want. Language in (B) would reduce that public outreach. Janet questioned what would constitute a community outreach event; Rodney suggested putting something in (B) to state that there are exceptions for community events. Dan suggested wording (B) differently in order to find a way around this because the issue is a liability issue with students who are not enrolled.

Lindsey suggested adding a sentence to the end of (B) to clarify: “Community outreach, public, or recruitment events that are held in conjunction with credit-bearing courses are exempt from this requirement.”

Megan indicated that this comes back to the issue of using state resources and more research needs to be done. Rodney agreed; so far the wording doesn’t indicate who is allowed to do the inviting and the outreach but leaves it open to everyone. Megan questioned if (B) is really needed right now. How do we delineate between current CWU students and community members? If the original problem is with gifting state resources then we’re back to the same issue.

Eric questioned the new (D) in the policy changes. Rodney explained that the changes apply to students who enroll in a course while they are currently taking a course that serves as a prerequisite for the upcoming course. Then, if the student failed the prerequisite, they should not be able to take the upcoming course even though they were able to enroll.

Lindsey put together a mock-up of how easy it would be to track attendance. Faculty

could go into MyCWU and bring up class(es), then scroll through dates and track past/present students who are absent. Past and present dates can be tracked but not future dates. The registrar's office would need the attendance just for the first three days of classes. Ideally, students should have to take some responsibility by confirming their attendance or they don't get their financial aid. Technically students could check the box for attending even if they are not there, but it would be confirming their attendance or their intent to attend. Students who don't confirm their attendance would not automatically be dropped; instead the registrar's office would reach out to the student with a phone call to confirm or to learn more about the situation. Overall it would be helpful to compare what students submit for attendance and what faculty submit. David suggested having a pop-up with something students have to sign or agree to that says they agree to be there.

Megan questioned if going this route would require rewriting policies again. What if students agree to be there but don't show up within the first three days? Walter pointed out that there are situations, such as with wildland firefighters in the fall, where you know the student won't be there during the first three days but intends to be there and will be there at some point. Eric questioned how special circumstances would be addressed in an online system. Lindsey indicated that students who know they have special circumstances should be working with the faculty member to address that. Janet questioned classes that meet Monday or Tuesday or only once a week, but Lindsey indicated she doesn't know of a good way around that.

Ke questioned if faculty are required to drop a student for non-attendance, or is it just a choice? Dan indicated that faculty can choose to drop a student but right now it's not a requirement; we need to clarify it. Megan indicated that there needs to be something in the procedure going beyond the first three class days, otherwise the procedure is contradicting the policy. What if a student checks the box saying they plan to attend but they don't show up? Lindsey indicated in that situation the registrar's office would communicate with the student to find out what's going on.

Lindsey suggested changing (C) as follows:

“The first day of the quarter is the first day of instruction listed in the university calendar. All students are expected to attend the first day of each class for which they are registered. Students who fail to attend the class without previous arrangements with the instructor or the department and do not confirm their attendance through the student information system will be dropped by the end of the third day of the quarter or by the first class meeting if the class does not meet during the first three days of the quarter. Students may be dropped for nonattendance only during the period described above. Nonattendance does not release the student from the responsibility to officially drop any course for which they have registered and choose not to complete nor release the student from the financial obligation of courses for which they are registered after the published deadline to drop.”

David questioned “Students may be dropped for non-attendance only during the period described above.” Does that mean they can't be dropped for non-attendance at any other time? Lindsey explained that students can still be dropped on the fourth or fifth day because it's still before the financial aid census. At any other time they get a NS grade and still have to pay tuition and fees.

Other changes to (C)

- change “may” to “will”
- change “the class” to “classes” everywhere it occurs
- professor/department needs to be plural

Dan suggested changing the policy name to “Class Attendance” rather than “Class Non-Attendance.” Rodney indicated that use of hyphens needs to be consistent.

Megan questioned if we are putting something in policy in (B) that is technically unethical by Washington state standards. It seems like more research should be done into contradicting other policies. Rodney indicated that if we are inviting people to sit in on a class without paying for it, then we’re violating our own policy. Walter indicated that this community outreach program goes back 10 or 15 years and there’s a lot of goodwill to the community in the program. Cody suggested checking with the attorney general and the auditor. Dan will investigate and see if he can find someone who can tell us more about the ethics angle of things but in the meantime preliminary changes will be made to the policy.

#### b. Student Conduct Statement

Janet indicated that this issue had been briefly discussed when committee charges were given. Back in fall Janet met with Richard DeShields, who shared a lot of information. The document is draft language for a policy statement to include in syllabi. The issue with this is that students don’t understand they can be removed from class if they are disruptive, so there needs to be a statement in the syllabus; however, different faculty see disruption differently. Everyone may not agree with what’s included in this draft but our job is to deal with the policy, and then Senate can provide other options to which faculty can add.

David suggested leaving instructors to develop what they want, but include something the in syllabi policy that mentions punitive damages and links to the WAC. It’s not possible to have something that will apply to everything. Eric questioned if the appeals process for students should be mentioned somewhere.

Lindsey suggested changing Number 10 in the syllabi policy to include: “...instructor's policy on academic dishonesty, expectations of student conduct, and possible consequences which may include expulsion...”

Cody indicated the idea is that faculty are defining what the issues are. If there are things that don’t rise to the level of the WAC, due notice is still given to the student. If faculty are going to take action on certain things, then students are aware. Rodney indicated that specific behavior expectations should go in the individual faculty member’s syllabus, but everyone shouldn’t be required to include something that might not apply to them. Dan suggested coming up with a general statement for syllabi, and then specifics can be added by instructors themselves. Cody indicated that Student Success possibly could have issues with that because having a specific statement makes things easier on their end.

David expressed concern that anything we create could conflict with the WAC; at a minimum we should be sure that anything on the syllabus adheres to the WAC. With including any sort of statement on the syllabus it becomes a punitive issue where there is the possibility for legal issues to arise. Is this something we should be pursuing without legal consultation? Megan indicated a professor could have expectation that go beyond the WAC, and this would enable them to include that on the syllabus. Cody suggested consulting with Aaron Brown or Jenna Hyatt, as they would be able to address the specific issues and questions that have come up. Lindsey suggested contacting Joey Bryant from Student Rights & Responsibilities as well. Dan will be in touch with them.

#### *New Business*

To be discussed at next meeting:

- a. Changes to course substitution policy & form
- b. GPA Definitions
- c. Appeals Process
- d. Academic Freedom

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Next Meeting:  
Feb 8, 2018