Executive Council Meeting
Dec 1, 2020, 8:45 – 10:45am, via Zoom

Present: Jason Naranjo (chair), Keith Nitta, David Socha, Julie Shayne, Surya Pathak
Tyson Marsh, Santiago Lopez, Nora Kenworthy, Shima Abadi

Guests: Sharon Jones, Scott James, Sandeep Krishnamurthy, Pen Moon, Grace Lasker

Welcome & Check-in

Adoption of Minutes: Nov 10 minutes approved

UWB Test Optional Policy: Discuss & Vote
Sharon Jones, VCAA and Scott James, Acting Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management.
- Test Optional policy voted on by GFO EC in Spring 2020 was emergency measure in response to Covid-19. Today's discussion/vote is to make test optional a permanent measure.
- UW Seattle has moved to eliminate use of test scores in admission.
  - Test scores only used for rare cases
  - "Test Blind" model (test scores not considered at all) being considered in response to concerns that Test Optional may further disenfranchise students (those with low test scores tend to not submit).
    - Downside of Test Blind model – outreach around tests provides opportunities to connect with students that may not be there otherwise.
  - Move to make test optional permanent to align with UWS and allow counselors and advisors to have a consistent, clear, and transparent messaging.

Questions/Discussion:
- How will students experience this?
  - Online application has "test optional" check box
    - Message communicated to deposited students, "if you have taken a test, please send us a score for research purposes."
- What percentage of students chose not to submit test scores for Fall 2020?
  - 13% - but decision for test to be optional was late coming. Expect upwards of 40% of students choosing not to submit test scores for submission purposes in future.
- How are governing bodies of SAT pushing back?
  - Claim that SAT combined with HS GPA has a higher predictive pattern. That is true but the difference is not compelling enough to continue to use test scores.
  - Making more materials free, waiving fees, considering alternative ways of growing business.
- Original intent of universities considering test scores was to ensure students come in with a certain set of skills. What is the substitute for checking on foundational skills?
  - There is a long-documented history of these tests being used to exclude certain students from admission.
  - UWB does a holistic review that has shown to be better at predicting student success
    - High school GPA

- Courses taken
- Grades (i.e. an "A" in chemistry vs. and "A" in choir),
- State requirements met
- Personal statements and guidance counselor statements about obstacles.
  - o A lot of institutions that have moved to a holistic approach have seen no degradation.
- When will the policy be re-evaluated?
  - o If permanent measure is passed, assessment will be done at 18-24 month mark
- First-year students may not have navigational capital to make the decision whether or not to submit test scores. How do we help those students?
  - o Communication efforts, outreach stressing UWB is sincere that test scores will not disadvantage students. Admissions transparent that this is a research-based decision.
- Does UWB look at test scores?
  - o Yes, if submitted, but students who don't submit are not disadvantaged.
- Since test scores only make a difference for a few students ("rare case" referred to earlier), why not go Test Blind?
  - o Test Blind discourages students from testing, preventing benefits of outreach. No way of knowing how many students outreach helps.
  - o UWB explicitly communicates that tests are used to recruit
  - o Test Blind is currently not supported by UW leadership so UWB going Test Blind would be a challenge since some students apply to different UW campuses.

MOTION by Naranjo:
Permanently adopt test optional policy

Seconded and passed without dissent.

Discussion & Planning for the Campus Course Cancelation Policy

Naranjo opened the discussion by acknowledging the common theme in previously gathered feedback that policy should be rank free. He then asked the council if they had any additional feedback gathered in their schools since the last EC meeting.

Discussion/Questions:
- Campus-wide policy should be mandated but schools should have certain degree of autonomy in drafting their policies.
- What if there is a course that is being co-taught by faculty from two different schools with conflicting school-level policies?
  - o That scenario is why a cross-campus policy is important. Need to remove barriers to cross-disciplinary teaching.
  - o Some other institutions have a separate body for cross-disciplinary teaching.
- How do we avoid stifling innovation? New courses may have low enrollment.
  - o Innovation conversations should happen within schools. Bare minimum campus-wide policy that allows schools to decide.
- ECs role should be to provide direction to schools when setting their policies and ensure faculty are protected, not delve into setting minimums.

- o UWB should not be asking faculty to do uncompensated work in future years.
- o Original intent of policy was protection of faculty and fiscal responsibility, not faculty or admin issues. Should be looking at strong shared governance within schools. Senior faculty have responsibility to speak up for junior faculty. Senior faculty voices need to be used.
- How do we get consensus from Deans? If we don't require Deans to make use of faculty labor in that quarter, there has to be a "debt". What is the solution?
- There may be student biases that lead to a course not filling, a hidden penalty for faculty.
- It can be particularly demoralizing for a Community Engagement course to get cancelled due to low enrollment because those courses take more effort on faculty and student part
- In regard to faculty (especially junior) teaching new courses, being innovative, that should be a shared responsibility so that innovation isn't an isolated event. What type of support could be provided to prevent the stifling of innovation?
  - o Understand that labor is not just instruction, it is prep, community engagement, etc
  - o Assure faculty that they are supported
  - o Include student-facing staff early on so that courses are anticipated.
  - o Annual review - merit-based processes need to include teaching innovation. Allow Deans to see effort put in by faculty.
  - o Include role for administration up front, before course goes through curriculum process.
  - o If a course has low enrollment in 1st instance, action needs to be taken. Some school-level solutions could address these concerns and protect faculty.
    - ▪ Campus-level policy telling schools to have protections in certain places.

Chair thanked everyone for their input and provided a timeline to bring the policy to a vote:

- Jan 12, revisions complete based on EC feedback
- Jan 20, review and discussion with Council on Academic Deans (CAD)
- Jan 26th, EC GFO final discussion & vote

An EC subcommittee (Naranjo, Pathak, Marsh, Nitta) will review and distill feedback and create edited draft by Jan 12. Chair encouraged all to reach out to him directly with comments or questions.

Discussion & Planning for Online Proctoring Ban Policy
Pen Moon, Director of Digital Learning and Engagement and Grace Lasker, Chair, CCASC

EC Chair explained that an error was made during Spring 2020 faculty vote on the Online Proctoring Ban. Quorum was not met. In addition, two suggested changes to the policy have been suggested; remove blanket exception for fully online programs and have EC review petitions/waivers instead of CCASC. Naranjo then turned the discussion over to Pen Moon, Director of Digital Learning and Engagement:

- Moon provided justification for request to remove blanket exception for online programs.
  - o UWB's current ban raises serious equity concerns
    - ▪ Only protects students enrolled in on-ground programs, fails to protect those enrolled in fully online programs, exposing them to ill-effects of online proctoring

- For some students, on-campus attendance is simply not feasible.
- Potential for litigation if UWB protects one class of students and not another.
- Suggest removing language around exception for fully online programs
  - UWB needs to find a way to support faculty in understanding pedagogy differently and provide different options for students to demonstrate knowledge and skills.
- Lasker explained that the Campus Council on Academic Standards and Curriculum (CCASC) doesn't feel that they are the appropriate body to review online proctoring petitions.

Discussion/Questions
- EC could review petitions but cannot offer alternatives to faculty
  - VCAA suggested 4-person standing GFO committee to review petitions. Meets when needed. Petitions could come through VCAA and could be discussed with committee.
- Consider diversity of courses/programs. Must allow for faculty autonomy.
- Policy needs more definition around "online proctoring tools". There is a range.
- Nitta, GFO Chair, suggested EC subcommittee look at this and come back
  - Subcommittee volunteers: Naranjo, Kenworthy, Lasker, Abadi, Nitta
  - Back with full draft at Jan 12 EC meeting – then decide if full faculty vote is needed
- CSS created first UWB fully online program and has enormous struggle creating tests that aren't cheatable.
- Time for campus conversation and culture shift to bring people to consensus. Include reps from each school/division and student reps. Dialogue needed.
  - UW Teaching and Learning council might be able to offer guidance.

Meeting Adjourned

Action Items:
- Subcommittee on course cancellation policy (Naranjo, Pathak, Marsh, Nitta) will meet in early Jan, bring revised copy of policy to Jan 12 EC meeting for review, bring policy to CAD on Jan 20, and back to EC for vote on Jan 26.
- Subcommittee on Online Proctoring Ban Policy will incorporate EC feedback and bring revised policy to Jan 12 EC meeting for review.

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri
Meeting adjourned at 10:45am
The next EC meeting Jan 12