

Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee

February 27, 2025

3:10—5:00 p.m.

Minutes

Meeting called to order 3:11 pm

Attendance

in person: Brent Hancock, Erich Foch, Keith Karns, Andy Piacsek, Cody Stoddard

guest: Peter Klosterman

via zoom: Wendy Cook, Julia Stringfellow

Approval of February 13 minutes set aside until a quorum is attained. Decision to approve via email after the meeting.

Chair report

- update on Charge 4: linking required information on syllabi to centrally maintained site. AVP Delgado is on board with having a centralized site and is organizing a meeting with Multimodal staff (Joy and Delayna), Peter K, and myself to discuss how it could be implemented.
- Legal analysis of the draft policy on student misconduct in academic settings was received from AAG Ellen Evans.

Old business

Charge 2: Discuss feedback from Ellen Evans (AAG) regarding Student Conduct policy

- Upshot of AAG Evans' analysis is that proposed policy and procedures "present significant overlap and conflict with the student conduct process as outlined in Chapter 106-125, particularly to the extent that the policy seems to carve out a separate process for disruptive behavior in certain academic settings and place it in the hands of faculty rather than the student conduct officer."
- Peter K. noted that the Provost has reiterated that faculty have a right to regulate speech in the classroom with regards to appropriate **time, place, and manner**. Cody clarified that this has a constitutional foundation.
- Committee reviewed WAC 106-125-020, which describes prohibited conduct by students on campus; paragraph (3) refers to Disruptive/Obstructive Behavior.
- Peter proposed that revised policy focus on courses of action that faculty may take during a class when a student is being disruptive, then specify a procedure for the involvement of OSRR (student conduct officer) to determine an appropriate course of action.
- Can faculty appeal a decision to allow repeat offenders back into the classroom? Concern is that students may assert a right to continue attending class and repeating the disruptive behavior. Examples were brought up of previous incidents in which this happened, leading to complaints by other students.
- Issue of what remedial action faculty can take for online class settings.

- Peter (or Cody) suggested a high-level meeting with the Provost, Veronica Gomez Vilchis (AVP Equity&Belonging), Veronica Pettigrew (OSRR), and Ellen Evans (AAG), where we bring a clear statement of Policy objectives that reflect faculty concerns. Goal of meeting to obtain consensus on what can be done in this policy.
- An outline of these goals was drafted. Andy will clean it up and send around for further comment while Peter works to establish this meeting.

New business

Charge 5: Clarify CWUP 5-090-040(41) part 2, specifically, the timeframe between a culminating experience, finals week, and the scheduled final exam time. Look at part 4 also: rescheduling final exam. Context: This and 5-90-040(40) were put in to clarify that faculty must hold some sort of culminating event (final) during finals week. Faculty were holding finals the last week of class instead. Finals week is included as an "instructional day", so students can't be cheated out of it. Specific questions:

1. Can a "culminating experience" be assigned prior to finals week and be due during Finals Week? If an ambitious student completes the culminating experience before Finals Week, is this still in compliance with the policy?
 2. Must the culminating experience be due during the class's scheduled Final Exam window as assigned by the Registrar? Or could it be due anytime during Finals Week?
- Regarding question (1), consensus is "yes", a culminating experience that is due during finals week counts as utilizing finals week as instructional days (part of the academic calendar), regardless of when the student completes the assignment. Students still have the opportunity to utilize that week; it is their choice to finish early and not utilize it. Andy will draft revised language that clarifies 5-90-040(41)(2).
 - Regarding question (2), both Eric and Keith described culminating experiences in their respective departments that do not strictly follow the published final exam schedule because of logistical constraints (e.g. limited access to necessary academic spaces). Other examples were shared of allowing students to turn in a paper during finals week that was not the scheduled exam time. Cody and Brent pointed out that if faculty schedule a due date for a paper/project at the beginning of finals week, regardless of scheduled exam time, that could result in a piling up of student due dates - better to make the due date coincide with the scheduled exam time to spread things out.
 - Andy will draft some clarifying language for 5-90-040(41)(3), particularly with regard to logistical constraints for scheduling culminating events/assessment.
 - Andy's edits will be discussed and voted on at the next meeting.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:50

Next Meeting: March 13, 2025 on Zoom