

Minutes

Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee

Nov. 30, 2017

Present: Rodney Bransdorfer, Clem Ehoff, Janet Finke, Christos Graikos, Dan Lipori, Megan Matheson, Ke Zhong, Julia Stringfellow, Walter Szgelia

Absent: Eric Bennett, David Martin, Lindsey Brown, Tim Englund

Guests: Aaron Brown, Gail Mackin, John Mounsey, Cody Stoddard, Jason White

The meeting was called to order at 3:32 p.m.

Minutes of Nov. 9, 2017 were approved as written.

Chair updates

No chair updates were given.

Old Business

a. *UNIV 101 Discussion*

Jason White and Aaron Brown from Advising, and John Mounsey, Assistant Director for First Year Experience, attended to discussion UNIV 101.

Dan reviewed some background surrounding the issue. UNIV 101 is not part of the new Gen Ed redesign, which brings up a lot of questions. Should the class continue in its current form or be redesigned? If it were redesigned what would be retained, such as certain trainings, and how would that be done? Are there certain things that should be in such a class?

Jason briefly discussed learner outcomes and common goals of first-year seminar classes. Retention rates are a big issue. A group of UNIV 101 instructors have been working on putting together four major themes for learner outcomes: 1) transitions/networking/belonging; 2) academic resources; 3) fostering personal development; 4) advising. Important course topics include campus resources, critical thinking, academic planning/advising, study skills, campus engagement, and time management. Aaron indicated that UNIV 101 is really a place where advisors and instructors can foster being a learner. Also creating a sense of belonging is important, especially for students who are ethnic minorities. Jason indicated more than 50% of CWU students are first-generation students.

Rodney pointed out that no one on the AAC is opposed to any of this; the committee is only trying to figure out how to implement UNIV 101 in the absence of the Gen Ed basic skills requirement. Dan indicated we agree these are valuable skills. The question is how we get them across to students. Is a class the best way to go about it or is there another way?

Rodney suggested creating online modules for the course that are similar to the faculty training modules, but with occasional face-to-face contact with an advisor and peers. The rest of the course could be self-paced so that the students who don't really need help can do it more quickly and those who do need help can spend more time and get the support they need. A method

such as this would require less class time and space so the advisors are in their offices more. The downside is that sometimes people don't take online modules as seriously as they do a face-to-face class.

John indicated that students tend to want face-to-face and group projects; he has observed this from his role working with housing and first-year student orientations. Students also tend to complete online modules very quickly but remember little of what they've learned. Aaron added that he appreciated the suggestion of online modules but it doesn't solve the problem of students who will complain about having to meet with advisors once a month. Jason suggested that finding a way to do both online and face-to-face instruction. Adding an online component would be easy because it's already an option for students who fail UNIV 101. Those students are given the option of retaking the class online.

Rodney suggested leaving the course the way it is, but changing the outcomes so they don't overlap with Gen Ed. Also add something that says all students are required to take UNIV 101 in their first year.

Aaron questioned how difficult it would be to have an online version of UNIV 101 that is open to the general population. Jason indicated that students coming in with 45 credits or less are required to take the course; those who come in with more than 45 credits are waived so we're not proposing that every student would have to take the course. Credits are typically cut at 45 because if students have a developmental course from another school that means they've been at that school for a year. Students who would take UNIV 101 at CWU should typically take the course in their first quarter, rather than their first year, for native freshmen. Gail suggested eventually considering an optional UNIV 301 for junior students that's more mature and covers things such as career services and how to be an employee. Rodney then suggested changing the outcomes/syllabi to not overlap and then rewrite a line of policy.

Jason indicated that in the last UNIV 101 was taught by faculty/staff and it came from the Assoc. Provost budget. Now advisors have been teaching it more. No one is paid to teach it but Advising would be open to continuing to work with departments; however, he can't speak to the funding issue. Dan indicated the CBA says advising is okay as long as it's 6 or fewer credits. Any more than that you might have to be part of the CBA. Aaron indicated that advising has just created an undergraduate advising council. It is peer-led but they want to have faculty involved because they advise as well. The council addresses topics such as professional development training and networking and would like to have a faculty member on that coordinating board.

Jason suggested the next step would be for Student Success to propose learner outcomes, and Lindsey will get pieces into curriculum. Rodney indicated that the AAC's job is to work on graduation requirements, or figure out where UNIV 101 fits into that. John indicated that everyone coming to orientation is using 40 credits for a cut-off but 45 is used everywhere else. It needs to be consistent.

Walter questioned how we can be sure students won't miss this. Can someone get all the way to the end of their degree without doing UNIV 101? Aaron indicated that it's unlikely because students would get a hold on their account. Jason explained that he sees what comes

through and has to waive every one of them. If something isn't caught then those students keep moving through, and if someone gets to their senior year without being caught they have to write a paper with the advice they would give a freshman in order to be waived from the course.

Dan questioned the idea of UNIV 101 being a graduation requirement. Is that what we want to do? Rodney agreed, if the registrar has a way of putting it into the system. Dan suggested clarifying that students get a hold on their account if the course is not done by 45 credits, but Rodney suggested waiting to vote until there's a firm number of credits as John had said there was discrepancy between 40 and 45 in some places. However, 45 is attached to the official definition of a transfer student.

Dan suggested making a motion with Lindsey's changes to the graduation requirements. Megan moved and Clem seconded the motion. Gail suggested changing "should" to "will" in the last sentence in (G). Motion passed with one abstention.

b. Foreign Language Policy

Delayed until next meeting.

c. CWUP 5-90-020 (5) International Admissions

The committee looked at the changes to this policy in spring but couldn't vote due to lack of quorum. Rodney moved to vote on the policy as amended; Janet seconded the motion and the policy as was approved.

Gail suggested having a conversation with the new director of OISP regarding the policy. Dan indicated that the office has sent two emails asking about the changes to the policy so they are aware of it.

d. Final Exam Week Policy

Currently the policy states that final exams are Monday – Thursday, but Monday is a study day. The policy needs to be updated to reflect this, and to clarify that nothing may be scheduled on that day. Also, SAFARI is used in multiple places in the policy but it needs to be updated to say MyCWU.

Walter suggested changing MyCWU to a generic term to avoid having to change it again when/if the system changes in the future. Also there is an issue with the Centers being closed on Fridays so they can't give exams on that day. Gail questioned if there would ever be a calendar issue where having exams on Friday would cross over contract dates but Dan indicated that would be unlikely.

Rodney suggested removing any mention of MyCWU altogether and just saying something such as "final exam dates are posted to the student's schedule 30 days..." and "grades are posted to..." Gail suggested using the word "submitted" instead of "posted." Dan suggested saying "final exam schedules are posted to the student's university account by the 30th day of the quarter." A consensus was not reached and the decision was made to keep the "MyCWU" language.

Rodney questioned why the AAC did not originally have any say in the scheduling of finals week. Janet indicated that it seemed to be a student-driven change.

Changes to the final exam week policy were approved with one abstention.

e. Interdisciplinary Programs policy

Dan indicated that he sent out the changes made to the policy following the Nov. 9 AAC meeting but only got one response from Lori Sheeran. She suggested clarifying charter and bylaws, as procedures are spelled out in bylaws in her program. She suggested deleting “more frequently as needed” from (B) and replacing it with “on a more frequent schedule to be determined by the program leadership working in consultation with the dean where the program resides” and also suggested adding “bylaws” everywhere the charter is mentioned.

Rodney indicated he did not agree with including “bylaws” where it hadn’t previously been defined or mentioned; the other change is fine. Gail pointed out that the program will be reviewed automatically so it doesn’t need to be mentioned again. Megan suggested changing “program faculty” to “leadership.” Dan questioned leaving the policy as it originally is or incorporating any of the new suggestions. The consensus was for leaving it as-is.

The interdisciplinary programs policy was voted and approved.

5. New Business

a. *CWUP 5-90-040 (34) Class Attendance & Participation Policy*

Delayed until next meeting.

6. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Next Meeting:

Jan. 11, 2018