

UGC Minutes of March 11 meeting

- Minutes of 2/12/24 Accepted
- **Update on GEAC and TECH requirement.** The conclusion reached by the GEAC is that the certified courses would stay but new courses would be encouraged that focus on changing technology such as AI. The UGC agreed to this also.
- **Automatic re-enrollment in WRT102 for students who failed the course,** proposed by Peter Khost.

Background. For many years WRT 102 course had suffered from an enrollment "backlog," meaning that not enough seats were offered to meet student demand. A one-time infusion of funding from the provost and close collaboration with Shelley Germana (Cc'ed here) eliminated the backlog for one semester. But preemptive measures are needed to prevent this from reoccurring, that is, with a goal of preventing students from putting off the course--as they tend to do, sometimes for years--after failing it.

Proposed auto-enrollment policy. Students who do not pass the course in a given semester would automatically be re-enrolled in the course for the following semester (unless they passed it in an intervening summer or winter term).

Rationale: If students know they cannot avoid the course, then they may be more likely to attend, (lack of attendance is the primary reason for failing) and perhaps work harder at mitigating the circumstances which led to their absence the first time around. This course needs to be passed early so that what is learned can be used and reinforced in the major of choice. Currently there is no way to force students to re-enroll in WRT 102.

UGC Discussion:

- The problem and desire for forced re-enrollment in WRT102 is understood.
- Concern voiced was that there must be a way for students to choose their section to avoid conflicts with required courses for their major.
 - The UGC envisions that re-enrolled students would be allowed to register for a section of their choosing.
 - If they don't re-enroll by a certain date they would be auto-enrolled into any available section.
 - But even then, they need to be able to switch to another section. Provided that these conditions are met the UGC consensus is that this suggestion can now be taken up by Shelley Germana with input from Diane Bello.
- **ASCC Questions/Requests for UGC from Shyam Sharma**
 - (i) **Hybrid” and other terms:** The ASCC currently requests departments proposing new courses or updates to courses to specify modality (viz., In Person; Hybrid - Online/In Person; Online - Sync/Async Combined; Online Synchronous; or, Online

Asynchronous) (for each mode of instruction used. There is a need for more clarity on these and other emerging terms. Is the above distinction adequate?

UGC Discussion: First opinion is to let CELT define the terms. But this will be revisited at following UGC meeting.

- (ii) **Clarity on “recitation”** in the context of online courses (esp. asynchronous): Does posting a video and asking students to complete a test qualify as a recitation? Would an interactive video qualify? Would a discussion board be adequate? Can recitation be approved at all as part of asynchronous courses? Or, isn’t the term “recitation” defined by co-presence of instructor and students, so students can ask questions and interact with peers? Does class size affect what is a recitation, so, for instance, a discussion in a 500-student lecture hall is not a recitation but one with 10 TAs who take up 50 students each is? The premise of this question is that it is not within separate curriculum committees’ purview to determine this and similar issues, or that they should be guided by a common university standard, ideally created through shared governance.

UGC Discussion: First opinion is to let CELT define the terms. But this will be revisited at following UGC meeting.