

AUC Academic Policies Subcommittee

Meeting Minutes

4/8/25, 3:30 p.m.

Miller Oval/Hybrid

PRESENT:

Soumitra Basu, Mojdeh Bayat, Lynn D'Agostino, Daneen Deptula, Lena Ficco, Robert Hynes, Jane Huang, Eileen Kirk, Lori Leonard, Pam McCafferty, Aisling O'Connor, Ozge Ozay, Connie Strittmatter, Justin Swaine, Collin Syfert

ABSENT: Beverly Hollingsworth, Samuel Tobin, Amy Kendrick, Andrea Olmstead, Daniel Welsh

GUESTS: Dustin Halterman, Jacalyn Kremer, Denise Simion, Kisha Tracy

Meeting convened at 3:33 p.m.

Motion to Approve the Minutes: Connie Strittmatter

Second: Pam McCafferty

Discussion: None

Vote: Approved 11-0-4 (For-Against-Abstain)

Motion to Consider AUC 89: Connie Strittmatter

Second: Pam McCafferty

Dustin Halterman spoke to the proposal which would require a minimum 2.0 grade in all required EDUC major courses in the undergraduate licensure programs. The rationale for the proposal is that students may do well in the earlier pedagogy courses and then struggle in the later methodology courses. Grades in the earlier courses keep their overall major GPA up. However, this means that students may not be as prepared in those later courses.

Discussion:

- How did you arrive at a minimum grade of 2.0? Looked at Stage 1 and Stage 2 GPAs and found that a 2.0 would keep students on track. Also looked at sister institutions and all but one had the same requirement. Also want to allow students to retake the course for credit and a grade < 2.0 would allow the repeat for credit.

- Is there a correlation between 2.0 and MTEL pass rates? Bio/Chem department currently reworking Life Science for Educators to be a stronger course to address science MTEL pass rates.
- How does this impact S/U policy? {answer to this question unclear}
- Does this apply to Ed Studies? No, only licensure programs.

Motion to Approve AUC 89: Connie Strittmatter

Second: Pam McCafferty

Vote: Approved 13-0-2

Motion to Consider AUC 102: Connie Strittmatter

Second: Pam McCafferty

Denise Simion spoke to the proposal which aims to add Low and No Cost (OER) course markings (tags) to courses in Banner. This aligns with a state initiative and reporting requirement. This is a result of many years of work by the OER Committee. Denise noted that the proposal addresses concerns and the mechanism for how this will occur. Registrar's Office has been involved. This is an issue of transparency for our students and most state institutions have implemented tagging already.

(Note that Denise Simeon, Kisha Tracy, Connie Strittmatter and Jacalyn Kremer all contributed to the following discussion.)

Discussion:

- Is this only a guideline from the state? It is a requirement to report low cost and no cost use. The mechanism through which this information is collected (such as through the seats list) is not specified.
- Is this the only way to do this? This is best way identified to date. The reporting process is currently very manual with gaps in the available data. It is not just about reporting, but also about transparency.
- Could cost be determined by reviewing the syllabus? Yes, but students would not likely see the syllabus at the time of registration and this would be a very manual process (i.e. to have someone review each syllabus every semester to find the cost information.) Cost of materials is required to be available to students prior to the start of the class but a mechanism does not currently exist.
- Confirming this will appear on the Seats List and in College Scheduler? Yes.
- How is No/Low determined? Is it through the bookstore or online/direct purchase cost? What if an older edition is less expensive? Costs will be determined based on the lowest cost option available through the bookstore since financial aid (book vouchers) are only applicable to the bookstore.

- What is the mechanism for faculty to report no/low cost? Do they need to repeat every semester? Faculty will report via a dynamic form each semester at the same time that they would report to the bookstore.
- Would faculty have to determine/find out the cost? Yes, we will be adhering to state standards for consistency and this is the best mechanism at present. Remember, reporting is only needed for low/no cost sections.
- How do we know the bookstore cost? If not OER, then the tool used via blackboard will tell the cost as part of the adoption process. If books are sent via the bookstore email, the faculty would need to ask for the cost from Danielle.
- What about adjuncts? Dynamic form will be online and accessible by adjuncts. This could be an issue for students registering in April for fall since adjunct may not be determined yet.
- Concerned that enrollments could be impacted. Survey data shows that cost is not the primary driver. Top drivers are time offered and if course needed.
- What if both an e-text and a hard copy exist (and only one is low?) This would count as low cost.
- Student perspective (from student committee member): Confirmed that time and what is needed drives course selection. However, not sure that students will notice this unless information is sent out.
- Our students have issues with costs (housing, food, books) and being transparent with book costs up front allows students to plan ahead and contact financial aid. Community colleges have been doing this for years so our transfer students are accustomed to this. Course tagging exists state-wide and we are late adopters. This transparency helps our students and aligns with our Mission and commitments in our strategic plan.
- Will there be an opportunity to provide input regarding the mechanism? Yes, the OER committee will continue to work on this and collect faculty input.

Motion to Approve AUC 102: Mojdeh Bayat

Second: Connie Strittmatter

Vote: Approved 12-1-1

Items from the Floor: None

Motion to Adjourn: Connie Strittmatter

Second: Pam McCafferty

Approved 14-0-0

Meeting concluded at 4:27 p.m.