California State University, Stanislaus
University Educational Policies Committee
February 10, 2022
VIRTUAL via Zoom

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

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

I. **Call to Order.** Strahm called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.
II. **Approval of Agenda.** The agenda of February 10, 2022 was approved as distributed.
III. **Approval of Minutes.** The minutes of January 27, 2022 were approved as distributed.

IV. **Announcements/Reports.** None.

V. **New Business**
  A. **Changing Catalog with limited input from impacted departments.** Peggy Hauselt joined the meeting. While completing the batch course modality change form, Hauselt was informed that two of her department's courses were not in Peoplesoft course catalog. Academic Affairs office staff had deleted the courses from the online academic catalog. She noted that one of the courses needed to be reactivated even though it was listed in the prior online catalogs. Aulak explained that it was listed in the prior online academic catalog, not the current catalog, because it had been deactivated. Emily Hake, ASC for Academic Programs, informed Hauselt she could reactivate one of the two courses, but one course would need a new course proposal because there was not accompanying documentation (i.e. syllabus) for that class. This raised a subsequent question: what is the priority system of record – Peoplesoft or the online catalog? Hauselt noted she only had information of the course that was in the online academic catalog. She was coming to UEPC because she is concerned that maybe there are other departments that this is happening to and they are not aware and this might be an issue that should be examined and resolved before it happens to another department.
      i. Wooley suggested all curriculum related questions should be discussed with Aulak before UEPC addresses them. Aulak shared this issue could have been resolved in a one on one meeting with Hauselt.
      ii. Strahm shared most department chairs and faculty are not aware of who they should contact for curriculum issues. There should be clear guidelines of who should be contacted first.
      iii. At some point, Deans handed off all hard copies to the Academic Program office, which were subsequently uploaded to Knowledgelake. In this particular case, Aulak did not find record of the course Hauselt

was referencing in Knowledgelake or in the Peoplesoft course catalog. Aulak noted that Emily Hake had requested Hauselt provide the documentation she may have of the course, but that Hauselt did not respond. Hauselt stated that she told Hake she was unable to find any documentation of the course. Aulak noted that, if there is no record of the course in PeopleSoft course catalog or Knowledgelake, it needs to be removed from the catalog as it is false advertisement to the students, which is why the course was deleted from the online academic catalog. Aulak notes that it is her responsiblity for keeping the online academic catalog up to date with PeopleSoft course catalog.

    iv. Strahm is concerned that this happened as it did. She does not blame the curriculum specialists for doing their jobs, but is concerned that courses are being deleted, regardless of department wishes (impacting their autonomy) even if there is no documentation/record. There must be some middle ground from which we can operate.

    v. Speaker Nakano stated confirmation from department must a requirement before deleting anything from the catalog. Aulak reassured the committee consultation does occur before removal.

    vi. Speaker Nakano suggested a timeframe should be given to departments for providing documentation before deletion. Aulak reassured the committee that this does happen.

    vii. Hauselt clarified that she was using this course as a placeholder. It is actually not a course a student can enroll in. Bernardo shared that many transfer students do not directly translate into our courses. The 2999 course number is given to them. The 2999 course number is a placeholder to provide credit. The 2999 course number is not on student transcripts. Hauselt shared that is what she was using the course as. It was to provide credit for study abroad students. Hauselt should be using the 2999 course number. The course that was deleted should not be in the online academic catalog- as 2999 courses are not in the online academic catalog.

    viii. Strahm thanked Hauselt for joining and sharing her experience. Strahm reiterated that courses should not be deleted from the online catalog. It is not important if there is documentation/record for the course if this is a course that can ultimately be brought up to date. Aulak reassured that courses are not randomly deleted from the catalog.

    ix. Wooley suggested Aulak and Hake to create a policy/guideline for curriculum related issues. This should better inform faculty. Aulak and Hake are here to support programs and UEPC is grateful to them!

VI. Old Business

    A. **WASC Report.** Wooley shared an update on input received for the WASC report. The report covers 2019-Dec 2021. Four years from now, there will be

university wide discussion on progress from this report. Committee provided more input.

    i. It should be noted that there will be more in-person availability for same services for extended time at Stockton campus. Is there going to be a push for in-person instead of virtual services? Faculty may offer online format because it can feel alienating to be on Stockton campus. There is limited support on that campus for faculty and students. There are renovations happening and will continue to happen. Stockton is hiring an operations manager soon. It will have some different duties and mostly it will be operations on campus. The physical services at Stockton should not mirror Turlock services. Collecting data is important. How do we plan to better understand the Stockton student population, their needs, etc? Support services especially need to be developed from the unique needs of Stockton students. There is a need to define "Stockton Student" first. It seems as if Stockton is a series of buildings and not an enacted vision, an identity, a purpose.

    ii. Next week, there will be hiring of library staff at Stockton library. Library should then be open longer than 9-5 p.m. Held suggested Wooley to add to report that the library keeps usage statistics to evaluate services.

    iii. Strahm is concerned about the brief comments of faculty in the report. There is a couple of sentences about hiring faculty. There is very limited discussion about faculty involvement and need for more faculty. There is more about administration, hiring deans and hiring managers. Wooley clarified there are about fifty references to faculty. This is in area one. Other areas are focused on budget, facility, and developing the plan. This report is focused. Campus was asked to report on specific issues.

        1. Strahm responded to Wooley that virtually all of those references he is describing were references focusing on other issues, they're just notations about faculty access or use, they're not about the actual importance, value, and contributions of faculty to the education of students on the Stockton campus.

    iv. There is no strategic plan for Stockton. It seems that WASC is driving progress in Stockton, not us. No decision is a decision.

    v. With administration turnaround the vision and emphasis, and priorities, has changed every time. There is also a limited budget. When there is economic downturns Stockton gets neglected. There are so many elements that continue to make Stockton stagnant and stuck. People in Stockton deserve better than what we've been giving them for the last two decades.

    vi. There is an equity gap for students at Stockton. An expansive view of Stockton students is needed. Where are we failing a particular view? How can we change a practice?

    vii. Committee will send more input to Wooley and Speaker Nakano.

VII.   **Tabled Business**
   A. **Academic Notice' vs 'Academic Probation'.** Deferred.
   B. **Consultation Principles.** Deferred.
   C. **11/AS/19/UEPC Revision to the Undergraduate Advising Policy/ASI Advising Resolution.** Deferred.
   D. **Core Competency FLC Policy/Procedure.** Deferred.
   E. **Grade Appeal Policy.** Deferred.
   F. **Notifications Regarding Mandatory Course Materials (Connect, First Day, etc.).** Deferred.
   G. **Community College Articulation Question.** Deferred.
   H. **Academic Dishonesty Policy.** Deferred.

VIII.   **Adjournment.** The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.
AS:ga