

California State University, Stanislaus
University Educational Policies Committee
November 4, 2021
VIRTUAL via Zoom

PRESENT: A. Strahm (chair), M. Chvasta (chair elect), J. Rosas-Nieto, T. Held, J. Strangfeld, K. Liu, O. Panagopoulos, G. Cook, M. Moberly, S. Wooley, D. Suarez

GUESTS: G. Aulak (recording), L. Bernardo, P. Garone

- I. **Call to Order.** Strahm called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.
- II. **Approval of Agenda.** The agenda of November 4, 2021 was approved as distributed.
- III. **Approval of Minutes.** The minutes of October 28, 2021 were deferred.
- IV. **Announcements/Reports**
 - A. The dynamic dashboard is launched; faculty widget will launch November 8, 2021.
 - B. Courses for fall 2021: 61% fully face to face; 11% hybrid; and 12% fully online.
 - C. Academic programs team will join the deans and department chair meeting on November 5, 2021. Information about WASC update on distance education and batch course modality will be shared. Members are to contact Wooley or Aulak for questions or concerns.
 - D. Chvasta shared Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (FBAC) notes from November 3, 2021.
 - E. Dana Nakano is the new Speaker of Faculty.
 - F. Priority registration for spring 2022 begins on Monday, November 8th. Enrollment Services office will be open and answering questions.
 - G. Wooley is collaborating with others on the interim report for Stockton due in March 2022. It will address the four issues from the previous report. Members discussed the lack of resources being a system-level issue. Legislature expresses interest in correcting these issues but nothing is done. Funds will pay for classrooms. The needs of people and state funds are often not synced.
 - H. Revision to grade option policy was voted to expedite the approval process and it should with President Junn now.
- V. **New Business**

A. Program Modification Process. Phil Garone, History department, joined the meeting. The program modification process needs to be defined more clearly.

- The history program is not changing the structure of the major, the unit requirements, or the prerequisites. Students choose widely what courses they want to take. There is only one required upper division capstone course. The rest of the major is divided into categories where students can choose their courses. When a brand-new course is created, it used to get added to the catalog. There are questions if we can update the catalog now. When history program adds new courses, it should not rise to a program modification. This is a problem that needs to be resolved.
- Aulak and Wooley provided clarification on the process. This process was approved by uepc: <https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Office%20of%20Academic%20Programs/approvalcurraction.pdf>. There is no policy for this process. The process has been that a new course can be added to the electives portion of a program. A program modification is required if the new course will be added to the requirements of the program. The new course is first a program requirement and second an elective. When they are tied to an area requirement, a program revision is needed. The courses function as required courses and electives. This might cause confusion and clarification is needed.
- Members discussed this issue. The required area should be changed without any review. The college curriculum committee does not have the purview to evaluate a program's sense of their own curricular areas. The current process might impact innovation and changes in the discipline.
- Aulak and Wooley will update the process document and uepc will review in the next meeting.

VI. Old Business

A. Preferred Name Policy. Speaker Nakano has compiled comments from QFAC. Bernardo and Strahm reviewed these comments and applied as necessary on policy. Strahm shared the policy document. UEPC discussed the revisions and provided more feedback. What would the process be for a student to appeal and what would it look like? Students affairs might need to create this process. It could also be from diversity center, faculty, or dean of students. Should the registrar's office be involved? Five csu campuses use the student code of conduct. Bernardo will consult with student affairs and dean of students. Student representation is important. Should the policy include a vague process? Or should the review process be a separate policy? This policy is for how this community will behave to people that choose to have preferred name. This policy is not about what could happen if somebody does something wrong. Some notation about misrepresentation, profanity, discriminatory language, etc. should be included in this policy. Policy could state it be reviewed by a university review body that will include faculty, staff, student representatives. Policy should also request that departments allow students to use preferred name outside of official reporting context. Legal name would

be used for reporting only. Policy language from Sacramento State: *Students who enter names containing inappropriate or obscene language or for those used for the purpose of academic misconduct or fraud will have their names removed at the discretion of university officials, which include faculty, staff, and student representation, and reverted to the primary name.* UEPC unanimously agreed on the revisions and to move policy forward.

B. Consultation Principles. Deferred.

C. Combining Calendar Policies into Single Document. Deferred.

VII. Tabled Business

A. Academic Notice' vs 'Academic Probation'. Deferred.

B. 11/AS/19/UEPC Revision to the Undergraduate Advising Policy/ASI Advising Resolution. Deferred.

C. Core Competency FLC Policy/Procedure. Deferred.

D. Grade Appeal Policy. Deferred.

E. Notifications Regarding Mandatory Course Materials (Connect, First Day, etc.) . Deferred.

F. Community College Articulation Question. Deferred.

G. Academic Dishonesty Policy. Deferred.

VIII. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

AS:ga