Meeting Minutes
Joint University-wide Curriculum Committee
October 20, 2022
11:45 a.m. − 12:30 p.m., Remote Meeting

Members Present: Solomon Abrams, Leslie Bach, Bill Bosl, Robert Bromfield, Dave Donahue, Joshua Gamson (Representing Jeff Paris), Ashlyn Glancy, Laura Hannemann, Katie Hoffman, Erika Johnson, Nick Leonard, Jo Loomis, Shirley McGuire, Michelle Millar, Megan O'Banion, April Randle, Diane Roberts, Natacha Ruck, Claire Sharifi

Members Absent: Cathy Goldberg, Nate Hinerman, Kate Lusheck, Deborah Panter, and two TBA members.

I.   **Welcome and Introduction of New Members (5 mins)**

Co-Chair and Associate Professor Jo Loomis welcomed all members and officially started the meeting. New members introduced themselves: Claire Sharifi, (Reference Librarian), Ashlyn Glancy (Transfer Student Representative, ASUSF), Sol Abrams (Vice President of External Affairs, GSS).

II.   **Approval of the Minutes (5 mins)**

Co-Chair Loomis asked members to review the minutes from the September 15th meeting and asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Michelle Millar motioned to approve the minutes. Megan O'Banion seconded the motion. Co-Chair Loomis asked if anyone was opposed to the approval of the minutes. There were no oppositions and the minutes were approved.

III.   **Review and Vote on JUCC Subcommittee Recommendations: Instructional Modalities Guidelines & Processes (20 mins)**

Co-Chair Loomis asked members to take a look at and react to the proposed guidelines in the current draft of the Instructional Modalities Definitions and Guidelines document.

Co-Chair Loomis explained that the purpose of the definitions and guidelines was to indicate modalities for the coursework so that students and faculty can be on the same page about expectations for the course with the goal to post them on the web page so that they are widely available. A discussion ensued. Key points were:

- Pedagogical and Emergency Reasons for Pivoting Between Modalities
  - The 10% deviation rule is arbitrary - we need to take advantage of flexibility that is gained from pivoting to hybrid format (e.g. in case of emergency and/or for pedagogical issues)
    - The number is a metric to communicate definitions to the community between modalities
    - A trial period will tell us whether we need to change this number. We haven't figured out what a better number is yet
    - How well will these percentages work out depending on class meetings?
    - Suggestion to create a grid/visual for what this might look like (Katie created a draft for subcommittee)
    - Perhaps there should be a statement prepared to justify this number
    - Suggestion for vote to state that 10% is planned pedagogical reasons in the syllabus and that current processes are to be used for emergencies and illnesses (etc.)
  - We need to consider the reasons behind pivoting between modalities (i.e. differences between emergencies vs. extenuating circumstances)
    - Is it up to the current policy within the school?
  - Consider value of letting students know the schedule ahead of time based on the modality that is already defined (e.g. a student may not be able to scramble at the last minute to find a room/equipment for an online class); instructors should delineate planned events in syllabi
  - Suggestion: 10% deviations for pre-planned pedagogical reasons and for emergency situations, use current process

- Modality and Student Needs
    - Teachers might consider how modality choice can potentially impact students (e.g. financial aid for students when taking an online course); many international students need to have a certain percentage of in-person classes based on their visa requirements
    - Are we pigeonholing academic freedom (meaning using the best possible mode) (i.e. harnessing pedagogical strategies we have learned during the pandemic) by assigning these definitions?
    - SONHP's hybrid programs do not present problems for their international students because, as they meet 51% in-person, they do not qualify as "online"
    - Student perspective: consistency is important; having modality information communicated to students (e.g. in syllabus) and knowing when we need to be online vs. on-campus is desirable
- Revisiting Hyflex
    - It has been an emergency tool
    - Comment from Policy Board about revisiting Hyflex as a modality
    - In the current guidelines, we included a note that the functionality of Hyflex could be maintained by cross-listing an online section with an in-person section
    - Currently, it would not appear in the list of modalities in the catalog; students would see the Hyflex course as either online or in-person; the technology solution of Hyflex is how students experience the class
    - There should be a trial period of implementation with feedback; we can ask for continuous feedback, especially regarding reinstating Hyflex as a modality
    - Student Perspective: feedback will be important; students were thrust into the online modality during the pandemic and since then, the quality of

online delivery has improved; we might query student body on the ability to choose a modality

- Hyflex offers student the opportunity to be present and not miss class when they are ill
- Cross-listing courses does not cover accommodating students; accommodating students is a different classroom management technique
- Stating that Hyflex is a classroom management tool is not taking away flexibility for teachers on a day-to-day basis; it is not something that students chose
- Hyflex can be kept as a tool and we might add a sentence asking instructors and students to make sure students' needs around in-person learning are being met
- What are the quality issues for Hyflex being used as an emergency (e.g. dealing with audio-visual issues during discussions can take away from more robust discussions)
- Hyflex gives students flexibility (e.g. commuter students)
- There is not a difference really with quality for Hyflex (e.g. online vs. in-person discussions feel similar, especially with guest speakers who appear on Zoom)
- Some programs have intentionally designed classes to be Hyflex; like any tool, Hyflex is successful when used intentionally
- The technology in the classroom makes a difference (e.g. type of camera in a classroom)

Co-Chair Loomis marked the time in the meeting and asked if the Committee would be able to agree to go forward and build in feedback after one year of implementation. Co-Chair McGuire proposed the Committee to vote on the following steps:

1. 10% deviation is for planned for pedagogical reasons
2. Use current processes for emergencies

3. The Committee will investigate Hyflex as a modality
4. The Committee will revisit after one year of implementation

The steps were put to a vote by the Committee. There were no nays or abstentions. The steps were passed.

IV.   ~~JUCC Core Task Force Recommendation: Update (5 mins)~~

V.   ~~Clarifications on the Final Exam Week Scheduling Requirement (5 mins)~~

VI.   Closing / Action Items (5 mins)

Co-Chair Loomis announced there would be communication regarding the next meeting in November. Co-Chairs McGuire and Loomis officially closed the meeting.