

Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee (FSCC)
Minutes – Accepted on 12-5-2024
November 21, 2024

Present: Dia Gary, Paul Ballard, Sayantani Mukherjee, Mengyu Ma, Erika Pazian, Lacy Ferrell, Tim Sorey, Benjamin White, Susan Merrill, Gayla Blaisdell, Arun Pillutla, Mike Pease, Mike Gimlin, Tennecia Dacass, Jennifer Dechaine-Berkas, Anthony Marquez

Absent: Lizzie Brown, Kurt Kirstein, Selena Castro, Library dean designee

Guest(s): Arturo Torres, Registrar

Meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m. (thereabouts). There was some delay due to technical issues in using the new meeting link as we lost host access to the original zoom meeting link. And we lost all former meetings' poll templates. Patience was required as polls were recreated simultaneously with the motions.

Minutes 11-14-24: A motion to approve the minutes for November 14, 2024 was initiated and seconded, and the motion carried.

Chair Report: A temporary secretary has been identified, Sandy Tennant, and plans to attend the next FSCC meeting on 12-5-2024. FS Chair, Peter Klosterman, has provided FSCC an opportunity to serve on the hiring committee for Janet Shields' replacement and the committee agreed that Paul Ballard would represent us well. FS-EC voted on 11-20-2024 in support of Toni Sipic "...joining FSCC in the winter while Mengyu Ma is on leave." Toni, who has already served two terms on FSCC, will get up to speed with our current policies and procedures...helping this current FSCC chair to formalize the "SOP for onboarding members to FSCC."

Approval Log 11-7-24: The motion to approve the 11-7-24 Approval Log passed.

Tim welcomed Anthony Marquez, our student representative. Tim will meet with him to discuss the purpose of FSCC and committee resource tools.

Review Log 11-21-24: There were no issues with the proposals.

Course Change:

It was moved and seconded to approve the course change proposals and send them out for campus review. Motion passed.

New Prefix:

Syantani explained that MBA courses will have the MBA prefix.

It was moved and seconded to approve the new prefix proposal and send it out for campus review. Motion passed.

Discussion over Hybrid Modality (as part of work on Faculty Senate charges):

Registrar – Arturo Torres explained that the Registrar’s Office is **proposing** the following definition for the hybrid modality:

Hybrid modality – Current procedure in CWUR 2-50-060(2)

Hybrid courses contain a combination of required in-person meetings (on the Ellensburg campus or at one of the CWU centers or instructional sites) and online components (real-time online meetings and/or asynchronous content). Required meeting times for all face-to-face in-person and any required online meetings will be listed in the schedule. **At least 50% of the course contact hours will be scheduled in-person weekly. Courses that fall below the minimum in-person guideline will need Dean approval.**

Arturo emphasized that his office took an approach that:

- Is clear to students and faculty.
- Is flexible to Deans.
- Provides a good balance between in-person and online classes. (e.g., 2 days/week to be directly with faculty, then other days to be online (for flexibility)).

Arturo described how his office looked at current scheduling data at CWU:

- 90-95% of hybrid classes at CWU now meet in person 50% or more of the time (very seldom less).
- Arturo said there are problems if there is too much variability in hybrid types.
- 50% weekly as an in-person course ratio provides easy scheduling. Meaning: It is easy to double up, so rooms are not left empty (providing good stewardship of room resources and reducing costs).
- CWU is doing a great job now but wants to codify the current ratio, so it is clear to students.

Discussion occurred over the following issues:

- Is it possible to meet face-to-face for the first half of the quarter and online for the latter half? (i.e., Are there other pathways for unique courses?)
 - Registrar – Arturo Torres: Yes, as flexibility is wanted. Exceptions to the weekly pattern would be routed to the Dean for approval.
- How coded for DE at Centers?
 - Registrar – Arturo Torres: As DE and hybrid. His office is working on a solution and creating a new modality to qualify DE as the in-person portion while the rest of the course is online. Students will see as hybrid in the schedule.
- How easy is it to route approval requests to Chairs and Deans for any courses with a different in-person ratio?
 - Registrar – Arturo Torres: Requests easily flow through the software system (which contains a button for approval).
- It is the responsibility of departments and dept. chairs, and not FSCC, to determine if students are meeting their 50% in-person contact time.
 - Registrar – Arturo Torres: In-person time is determined by number of contact hours between student and faculty.
 - Recording lectures and requiring online discussions does not constitute contact hours.
 - Extra activities (e.g., homework) which are not done inside an in-person class are not considered contact hours.

- Need direct contact with faculty to qualify as contact time.
- For example, if a five (5) credit course meets in-person 4 days/week with the 5th day used for online activities (online tests, watching required videos, etc.), the course should be defined as “Hybrid.” This satisfies audit requirements.
- In-person means all contact hours meet in-person with faculty.
- Contact hours mean a lot to the university to help folks know what is occurring with teaching and learning.
- Registrar’s definition allows for flexibility to teach what is best for students.

Motion was made to adopt the Registrar’s definition of “Hybrid Modality” as written; motion carried. Tim said this adoption completes one of the three charges given to the FSCC by the Faculty Senate.

Tim congratulated Arturo for the hard work he has done.

Tim said he will take the approved hybrid modality language to the Faculty Senate for its 12/4 meeting discussion and vote. And he will recommend the Faculty Senate approve the MBA degree type as well. Tim will be at the 12/4 Faculty Senate meeting.

However, the MBA prefix proposal is currently going out for campus review, and once approved by the FSCC, it will go to the Faculty Senate for its consideration.

Consider revising the curriculum deadline table to increase clarity (as part of work on Faculty Senate charges):

The FSCC reiterated their approval of the curriculum deadline table as recreated by Susan and Janet.

Paul and Tim were contemplating creating multiple flow charts suited to different proposal types. With additional exploration of the Curriculog software, they observed that a comprehensive “workflow” is generated for the originator to follow. Anyone who originates proposals in Curriculog, will automatically see what workflow is associated with their proposals. Thus, additional diagrams are not needed to accompany the curriculum deadline table.

Mike G. was asked to demonstrate “workflow” scenarios and the steps of “thumbs-up/signing off” that are needed for completion of reviews.

Mike previewed various workflow sequences in Curriculog (and did a launch test) and showcased:

- How all workflow has to be done pre-launch. (Otherwise, a custom launch will be needed.)
 - If path taken is a “little” wrong, an email to the Registrar’s Office can correct.
 - If a lot is off, a relaunch will be necessary.
 - Mike can intervene (e.g., forced actions) for requests pertaining to HOLDS as deadlines are approaching for approvals.
 - Due to software issues encountered in the past, it is necessary to give Mike G. plenty of time if you are requesting a HOLD be placed before a deadline approval date. It takes time to process such requests.
 - First-time users can go down wrong pathway.

- In summary, when the correct buttons are clicked, the correct workflow is generated.
- Choices determine workflow (i.e., what review is triggered and required).
- Save changes as you proceed.

Can FSCC play a role in supporting originator and reviewers with navigating the “User’s Guide” for the curriculum software?

Ideas included:

- Tim: Create a form so that software developers or Registrar’s Office can use when adjusting or adding to the curriculum software’s User’s Guide.
- Mike G., Sayantani and Tim: How can we (FSCC) encourage/optimize communications between originator, faculty, and dean of college in this curriculum proposal review process?

In addition to using Curriculog’s User’s Guide, the FSCC Chair and Chair-Elect can help share specific instruction and guidance in navigating the system.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.