Minutes
Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee
Nov. 9, 2017

Present: Eric Bennett, Rodney Bransdorfer, Clem Ehoff, Janet Finke, Christos Graikos, Dan Lipori, David Martin, Lindsey Brown, Tim Englund, Walter Szgelia
Absent: Megan Matheson (excused), Ke Zhong, Julia Stringfellow
Guests: John Bowen, Bobby Cummings, Elvin Delgado, Duane Dowd, Gilberto Garcia, Gail Mackin, Cody Stoddard

The meeting was called to order at 3:33 p.m.
Minutes of Oct. 26, 2017 were approved as written.

Chair updates

     Concerns surrounding UNIV 101 will be the main topic for the next meeting on Nov. 30. Guests from Academic Advising will be attending. Gail is running a team for increasing retention. They are looking at retention rates and have concerns about how changes to UNIV 101 may affect retention; they are asking Dan or a designee from AAC to be on the team. The team has been able to identify which students we are losing and employ tactics to help them.

     Lindsey reported that people are requesting to hold various events, such as recitals, on the study day before finals week. Policy has not yet been changed to reflect that finals week is Tuesday – Friday, not Monday – Thursday. However, some of the centers are closed on Fridays, so having finals fall on Fridays creates a problem for them. Janet indicated that students added dead day (Monday) back so the question is, should things such as recitals or other events be allowed on dead day? If so, how do we enforce it, but it's not defined. Lindsey indicated that we do not have anything defined at the moment, and this issue is currently coming up so what should be done in that case? Voluntary events such as a study session are one thing but students are not supposed to be required to attend events on that day.

Old Business

     a. Foreign Language Requirement

     Rodney indicated that the foreign language requirement appears three different places in policy. The admissions part doesn't need any changes because remediation is already in place. The transfer part doesn't say anything about foreign language, only Gen Ed, but foreign language is no longer part of Gen Ed. The other is part of graduation requirements. One question is whether or not we want to add that students will have to meet Gen Ed and admissions requirements, because then they are exempt from the foreign language requirement. Another question is whether or not putting in a clause to exempt BAS students will make us out of compliance with CATER.

     Cody mentioned that massive resistance came from Provost Council regarding the proposed changes to this policy. All four colleges had issues with some aspect of it; COB said it would make them add credits to their majors. Gail explained that part of it is we have basically agreed upon admissions standards with the Washington Student Council. All other four-year institutions in the state have to follow the same standards. Lindsey added that a transfer student is anyone with 40 credits of more but that doesn't always mean a DTA. Transfer students can also submit high school transcripts. Gail indicated that CWU gets 2500 transfer students, so with

the way the policy is written, it means we would have to look at transfer and high school transcripts for all of them.

Rodney indicated that we are saying the foreign language is an admissions requirement and a graduation requirement, but having it as a graduation requirement is repetitive. It should be taken out of the graduation requirements if it's going to be an admissions requirement. Lindsey suggested leaving the admission requirement and the graduation requirement separate. Take out the basic skills requirement and take out the reference to the general education policy. This takes the foreign language requirement out of Gen Ed but leaves it in the graduation policy; by doing that it will catch those students who came in without having foreign language before graduation.

New Business

a. Interdisciplinary Studies Policy Discussion

Last year the committee was charged with creating guidelines for interdisciplinary studies programs. They met with the chairs of the interdisciplinary programs to get feedback but then the policy got stuck at Senate. It came up on the charges again this year so the committee wanted to get additional feedback from the interdisciplinary programs chairs.

Dan asked for questions or initial feedback on the existing policy. Patrick McCutcheon and Lori Sheeran were unable to attend the meeting and sent comments via email.

John commented that the policy would work well for the interdisciplinary studies programs connected to geography but would suggest saying "workload release time" under workload units. Janet indicated that, regarding full-time faculty or full-time NTT, if someone is doing a directorship or service they are doing something different than their regular workload.

John indicated that there is nothing about funding in the policy. Also, some programs have MOUs when courses are taught by faculty from multiple departments. Tim explained that that is in flux at the moment and depends on how colleges are assigning SCH; however, it is a valid concern. Cody indicated the Budget Executive Committee will be working on that as well. Tim suggested it should be in the bylaws part of the policy, but last year when working on it we tried to make the policy as generic as possible so that the particulars could be fleshed out at the program level.

Bobby questioned (2).(B) regarding approval of the election of the program director. Does the dean need a reason for not approving an election? Dan indication that the process would be similar to the election of department chairs. For a dean to not approve an election would be a rare occurrence but the administration would want something about approving elections in policy.

Dan mentioned Pat's emailed comments discussing wording changes and a few small word deletions in sentence 1 in the policy introductory statement. For sentence 1, Pat is suggesting: "Allowing students and faculty to explore, create, and integrate knowledge that combines and extends the traditional disciplinary boundaries." Eric questioned the meaning of (1).(B) regarding review of the program charter.

Rodney and Tim suggested striking "combines" in sentence 1; boundaries can't be combined but they can be extended. Lindsey suggested who will be reviewing the charter. Dan indicated that we had assumed it would be the programs but a process should be added in.

Gail questioned if items such as "assessment" and "program review" should be included. Dan indicated it would be in the individual charters. Gail questioned if a faculty member who teaches in an interdisciplinary studies program can report to two different people such as their chair/dean in their home college as well as the one in the interdisciplinary program? Tim

indicated that it has been done with Gilberto in his program.

Dan suggested going through the policy section by section in order to review and suggest changes.

Gilberto questioned (2). In his program there are two directors, but they go back and forth between director and assistant director. As (2) is currently worded, it sounds like there is only the program director. Janet suggested adding (s) to "director." Rodney suggested changing "directors" to "leadership" where necessary; Janet agreed but indicated that we don't want to get into the position of saying how that leadership should be structured. Dan suggested still having it structured in a way so that one person is the main one in charge but each has different duties.

Tim questioned (1).(A).2. AIS is housed in COTS but is almost evenly split between CAH and COTS and is difficult to declare the preponderance of credits. Rodney questioned who owns the courses that have the Interdisciplinary prefix. Tim suggested making a reference to this policy when establishing a new interdisciplinary program. Dan questioned how credits for a program such as AIS would be determined; Lindsey explained that it is based on where the program was housed when it was developed.

Duane questioned (2).(A) regarding election of the program director. What happens if the dean decides to elect someone other than who was originally elected? Dan indicated that the process is the same as the election process for department chairs; however, there is no mention of program directors under the CBA. The language here suggests that deans are bound by the language in this policy. Walter suggested saying something like "reflecting the process for department chairs." Tim indicated that this is covering the election process for program directors. A lot of the bigger interdisciplinary studies programs have different faculty, some who can vote and others who can't, which is what (1).(A).4 is getting at.

Lindsey questioned if changing "director" to "leadership" will affect the requirements for release time. Tim indicated that what has been done historically is to take the release time and divide it by the people who are eligible. Duane suggested defining the number of workload units a dean is able to assign. Possibly the minimum number of workload units should be specified. Tim indicated that the workload reassign time for the directorship should be in the individual program charters [section (1)] but then it would have to be renegotiated every year. Janet suggested adding to0 (1).(A).5.: "define duties and workload of the program director."

Dan asked for comments on parts (3) and (4) of the policy. Janet pointed out an inconsistency with wording – in (1.)(A).2 we are saying "establish residence" but in part (4) we are saying "housed." "…is housed" should be changed to "resides." Gail indicated that the capitalization of "Dean" needs to be edited for consistency throughout the policy and should be made lowercase unless referring to a specific dean. John questioned if (3) could go under (1) and (4) be eliminated altogether.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Next Meeting:
Nov. 30, 2017 – Barge 304