

California State University, Stanislaus
University Educational Policies Committee
February 24, 2022
VIRTUAL via Zoom

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

GUESTS: G. Aulak (recording), L. Bernardo, R. Grimshaw, K. Hope, J. Wittman

- I. **Call to Order.** Strahm called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.
- II. **Approval of Agenda.** The agenda of February 24, 2022 was approved as distributed.
- III. **Approval of Minutes.** The minutes of February 10, 2022 were approved.

- IV. **Subcommittee Minutes/Reports.** Deferred. UEPC will review and approve them in the next meeting.
 - A. Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee May 17, 2021 Minutes
 - B. Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee September 30, 2021 Minutes
 - C. Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee November 18, 2021 Minutes
 - D. Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee December 16, 2021 Minutes
 - E. General Education Subcommittee September 7, 2021 Minutes
 - F. General Education Subcommittee September 21, 2021 Minutes
 - G. General Education Subcommittee October 19, 2021 Minutes
 - H. General Education Subcommittee October 5, 2021 Minutes
 - I. General Education Subcommittee November 2, 2021 Minutes
 - J. General Education Subcommittee November 16, 2021 Minutes
 - K. General Education Subcommittee December 7, 2021 Minutes
 - L. University Writing Committee May 10, 2021 Minutes
 - M. University Writing Committee October 11, 2021 Minutes
 - N. University Writing Committee December 6, 2021 Minutes

- V. **Announcements/Reports**
 - A. Wooley suggested revising the grade appeal policy. The idea is to provide clarity for reviewers. This is a tabled item on the agenda. UEPC agreed on revising this policy. Wooley will share a draft revised policy in the next UEPC meeting.

- VI. **New Business**
 - A. **X/AS/XX/ATLC California State University, Stanislaus Policy for Online and Technology Mediated Courses and Programs.** UEPC reviewed the policy. Strahm will confirm with ATLC if this is a new policy or revised policy. Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) has two definitions: distance education and in person:

<https://www.csustan.edu/accreditation/wasc-accreditation/wasc-substantive-change-review>. Stanislaus State campus has nine definitions.

- i. Should campus definitions should align with WASC definitions? This will align policy with how our campus reports to accreditors and Chancellor's Office. Some members suggested the multiple definitions can be confusing. The class schedule lists them and it is not necessary. They are redundant and simplification is needed. Others believe multiple definitions provide more clarity and are important. Campus should decide what is best for faculty and students.
- ii. What is the difference between Hybrid and Hyflex and Bisynchronous? Would 30% remote instruction fall under hybrid? What is the difference between Distance or Distributed learning and Online? The language "traditional course" is an issue.
- iii. A major issue is that in *section 1.1* courses that use LMS is considered having an online component. This is extreme. Some faculty use Blackboard in all their courses. They are technology mediated but definitely not online. The definitions do not distinguish anything and this is a problem.
- iv. The second paragraph stipulates that emergency temporary conditions are different than normal. Is that distinction clear? For example, will Covid ever be gone? Do we know what it will look like when we arrive at a point where we are no longer in emergency temporary conditions? Are we already out of that? This document does not seem to accommodate the current emergency situation where faculty transition to work remotely.
- v. *Section 2.1* does not discuss cameras required during class. There are students that do not have the resources to do this. The hotspots and Chromebooks provided to them are inexpensive and do not serve well. Also, there are privacy issues. Some students do not live alone and this has nothing to do with their commitment to courses. The public forums that were conducted to inform us of faculty perceptions were mostly attended by those who were for requiring students to have their camera on. One of the suggestions was faculty with good reason can require students to turn on their camera and students should be made aware before registration. However, this would not work for required courses.
 1. This section should include *"We also are committed to ensuring equitable outcomes for students whose circumstances are such that their access to technology and other resources does not diminish their ability to fully engage in their coursework and does not impact their grades. This includes a reaffirmation that it is against university policy for instructors to require student computer cameras to be on while in a synchronous, bisynchronous, hybrid, or hyflex course. This prohibition includes any and all activities associated with the course including, but not limited to, quizzes, exams, lectures, presentations, etc. A student's living conditions, nor their financial status, nor their access to technological infrastructure, should have any impact on their ability to participate in a course and should not have any bearing on their participation,*

exam, quiz, presentation, group work, projects, etc. scores, nor on their final grade."

- vi. *Section 3.5* Can a faculty member decide to teach any modality even though course has an approved modality? It needs to be requested and negotiated with department and college. Autonomy is department and college is important.
- vii. *Section 3.10* What counts as interaction? Strangfeld shared she teaches an asynchronous course and does not meet with students. Course cap is 30. The instructional hours are the same as other courses. Can class size increase? The type of class and its activities is more important than just interaction. The concept of interaction is vague. A capstone or research course has 20 students and it is already sufficient amount of work. Maybe an additional like of "*in consultation between faculty and department chairs*" can be added for flexibility. Should we need to develop an inclusive definition of student-teacher or student-student interactions?
- viii. For *section 4.7*- Who will do what and why?
- ix. Isn't *section 5.5* self-evident? Why does it need to be stated for an OTM course in particular? Is this a document where key things are emphasized, even though should be already understood? How is that then "policy"? Same for *section 5.6* and *section 5.7*. Is this a policy or a helpful reminder?
- x. Strahm will send collective input from UEPC to ATLC.

B. UWC: The Formation of Graduate Writing Assessment Committee (GWAC). Rachel Grimshaw, Kate Hope, and John Wittman joined the meeting. This is University Writing Committee's (UWC) proposal to revise Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) on campus. UWC is a subcommittee of UEPC. A writing proficiency (WP) course introduces disciplinary specific new genres of writing that they have not encountered before. The proposal's idea is to design something that would be good for writing and campus. It would be supporting student writers, writing, and faculty teaching writing. Proposal helps inform both established resources and developing resources. It is assessing writing when students are making their way out of the door. The assessment could be used for Academic Program Reviews (APR) as well. Proposal specifically eliminates the high-stakes testing. It is assessment of random samples. The assessment would occur at college/department or WP level. There is no single rubric. UWC members would be doing the assessment, working with faculty on developing their rubrics, and reporting information to the campus community. Recruiting will occur across campus. The goal is to be informative rather than directive. Departments will decide for themselves.

- i. UWC is asking for UEPC support before moving forward in implementation in summer and launch in fall 2022. The proposal will be updated as it is implemented as it is a pilot project. The inaugural year is labor intensive.
- ii. UEPC provided feedback on the proposal. It is an issue for departments that only have one instructor teaching a WP course. Faculty will not be anonymized. The notion of writing across curriculum is great. Some faculty are not trained writers.

Some are professionally trained disciplinary writers. The problem is that faculty do not have time to teach basic writing to students so there is less writing work. Then, students struggle in a WP course.

- iii. Here is the document that is leading to required revision of GWAR. Updated in 3-2021: <https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/9585618/latest/>.
- iv. Strahm thanked guests for joining. The proposal will be revisited in the next UEPC meeting.

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 4:00 p.m.

KB:ga