CAAC Meeting Minutes
September 25, 2018

Voting Representatives Present: Robin Rarick (for Elliott Cheu), Barbara Citera, Melissa Fitch, Michael Staten, Kim Jones, Amy Kimme-Hea, John Koshel, Francesca López, Pam Perry, Lucinda Rankin, Martina Shenal, Janet Sturman, Jim Baygents, Barbara Bryson, Mary Koithan

Additional Representatives Present: Pam Coonan, Chrissy Lieberman, Martin Marquez

Absent (without proxy): Keith Swisher, Douglas Taren, Ted Tong, Maria Manriquez

---

Chair Kim Jones called the meeting to order at 11:02 AM.

I. Approval of Minutes from the August 28, 2018 Meeting

II. Agenda Items

a) Syllabus Template Proposal
Discussion of the three proposed versions of the absence and class participation policy recommended language. The versions have modified language with input from the Office of General Counsel and Disabilities Resource Center. The modified wording is recommended language and draws attention to the fact that instructors should not be asking about medical issues. CAAC members requested adding explicit guidance for instructors regarding medical issues and provide additional examples of the wording for departments to use in syllabi. CAAC members suggested adding a note to version C indicating that this wording is just a template and instructors can use their own department/college language as long as it does not include requests for medical records and remove the term unexcused and excessive, leaving only "absences". Discussion of what constitutes an excused absence, increased DRC referrals, and DRC wording. Chrissy Lieberman recommended adding Dean of Students wording to direct students for additional support. Kim Jones asked Chrissy Lieberman to generate the wording. Discussion on late withdrawal deadline and college petitions requiring documentation for extraordinary circumstances to withdraw after the deadline. Kim Jones requested colleges take a look late withdrawal process and table for now. Chrissy Lieberman asked members to look at complete withdrawal during summer sessions.

Kim Jones made motion to approve version 'C' with additional Dean of Students' language. Cindy Rankin seconded. Motion approved with 1 abstention.

Note: wording submitted from Chrissy Lieberman: "If you are experiencing unexpected barriers to your success in your courses, please note the Dean of Students Office is a central support resource for all students and may be helpful. The Dean of Students Office is located in the Robert L. Nugent Building, Room 100, 520-621-2057"

b) Admissions follow-up regarding admissions data
Kasey Urquidez asked if having a single link with admissions data was okay versus the current practice. Colleges could download their own applicant data. Access to all data vs individualized college data. CAAC members requested additional demographic data, which used to accompany admissions data, be included in the dashboard.

c) Curricular Affairs Update-Martin Marquez and Pam Coonan
Offering Curricular Affairs staff to present and discuss proposed program workflow, new course best practices, adding campus/locations, and annual ADVIP updates. Requested information from departments on how 498 and 498H courses are taught, individualized or whole group. Potentially reword

the definitions of these course types to capture the breadth found on campus. Honors College planning to do a similar audit of quality/rigor regarding 498H courses. Curricular Affairs will follow up with email to CAAC members about presentation topics and contact department heads and course initiators regarding 498/498H courses. Discussion on contact hour data, meeting patterns, and impact on HLC. CAAC member requested sending out contact hour information and publicizing it campus-wide. NC-SARA request for reporting on field courses crossing state borders with minimum of two students and instructor to trigger physical presence. Plan to send request to identify the content courses crossing state lines.

d) Strategic Planning Update- Elliott Cheu
In the middle of implementation/planning stage. Developing implementation plans for over 50 initiatives. Going to senior leadership to understand cost, paying, and prioritizing initiatives. Will not have a holistic view of the cost and resources until the end of October. November 16 deadline for presenting to ABOR. Initiatives are moving fast and some do not have outcomes yet. However, there is discussion on plans for getting from here to there. Concrete examples include investing in campus-wide CRM and creating a new general education program. CAAC member mentioned that UWGEC decided not to submit a moratorium on general education courses. CAAC member asked about having a college for GE. Idea to have an undergraduate college was independent of the general education review. Review committee stated that there needs to be central governance of general education and suggested a model of a center of general education. Overarching vision of the strategic plan is paying attention to student outcomes. Discussion on BGS and undecided students needing a college. This organization would have central and quality control. Would build in assessment of general education. Retention efforts and services across campus vary and this organization would bring these together under one roof. CAAC member asked why other potential models have been disregarded. This proposed organization would be unique when compared to other institutions by offering all of the services in one point of contact.

d) Duolingo- Brent White, Nick Ferdinandt, and Chris Tardy
Brent White provided the history of Duolingo at UA including presentation to deans and determining cutoff score. Initial score accepted decided based on equivalency of TOEFL score of 77. There is a moratorium for accepting students based on Duolingo scores in order to gather data. University of Alabama has a Duolingo score cutoff of 51 and requires 79 on TOEFL. Plan to reach out to University of Alabama to get information on their cutoff and relevant data. Plan to go back to Duolingo to request for additional data. Brent recommends setting an automatic admission cutoff score and providing a range permitting admission with additional resources/requirements. Duolingo cost and immediate results makes it beneficial. Brent stated a belief in disrupting monopolies and that IELTS and TOEFL have some nefarious influence.

Nick Ferdinandt discussed Eddie White's report recommending not to take Duolingo because of test security and that the exam is a proficiency exam for English and not an admissions test- does not test academic English. The test collects limited amount of writing samples, and speaking samples are not included in the score. Productive skills are not authentic to what is being considered for admissions tests. Had fifteen students take the exam. Inconsistent student results. Spoke to University of Alabama counterpart, Bill Wallace, stating that their score of 51 is probably going to be raised to 71. Proposing 60 for admission to CESL pathway program and auto admission of 70. Monitor student data and adjust scores, as needed. Three of the fifteen students did not come to UA because they felt their scores were not strong enough. CAAC member asked about the concern with test security vs having a cutoff score. Nick stated that the first recommendation is to not accept Duolingo. However, if accepting Duolingo to have a score setup similar to the University of Missouri (60 for pathway, 70 and above for admission).

Chris Tardy provided a description of the writing component in TOEFL. Students are required to complete two writing tasks including independent (agree or disagree essay) and integrated (simulate using academic language). Composite score, previous instruction, writing habits, and two additional writing samples are considered for placement. With TOEFL and IELTS students do not require the additional

information. Duolingo writing samples do not provide information about academic writing and results would have resource implications for placement. CAAC member asked about conditional admission and coordinating the needs of CESL and the writing program. CESL could pull that information if requesting a writing sample.

Brent asked to find a range and providing additional sample. Concern about cost and innovation to provide access. Variability in TOEFL/IELTS testing and placement. A CAAC member asked about the possibility of creating our own admission testing, why is Duolingo needed? Duolingo already has marketing, data, and systems in place. CAAC member asked if questions can be asked directly of Duolingo representatives. CAAC member described issues with Duolingo tool at micro-campuses. Students are eligible to take the exam three times without a waiting period. Would like to understand how students interact/use the tool. Brent went over the Duolingo test protocol including proctoring and problems encountered (eyes on test, call to prayer disqualification, and student experience). CAAC member requested more information about the testing protocol and administration. Discussion of CESL English proficiency test in development for micro-campuses. Planning to offer CESL endorsement programs at micro campuses. Nick discussed contacting/researching institutions using Duolingo. Found that institutions use Duolingo as supplementary. Discussion of the process of conditional admission and I-20. CAAC member asked about data of TOEFL students and success. CAAC member asked about the process for setting cutoff and conditional scores and establishing UA policy. Admission policy is the same at micro-campuses as main campus. Score cutoffs would be an evolving approach based on student data.

Without presenters: CAAC member expressed concern regarding test administration. Another CAAC member provided additional details about TOEFL scoring and working with English language learners in the writing program. CAAC member provided details about the process that took place to change the IELTS score. Resources, support, and investment needed to fully support students taking Duolingo. Discussion regarding accessibility and cost and connection with strategic plan initiatives. CAAC members agreed that there is a need to find the cost of this initiative. Duolingo needs us as much as we need them, would be a boon to them. CAAC member asked to do additional research of institutions using Duolingo and the importance of including relevant experts in the field when making decisions.

III. **Additional Discussion**

Discussion of undergraduate college/strategic plan including general education report and taskforce work and recommendations, the need for a synthesis argument for general education, and UWGEC reimagining general education. Discussion of reorganization of administration and making decisions without having holistic view of the implications of those decisions. CAAC member suggested that CAAC serve in a consultation role when decisions are being considered, provided examples of changing proficiency scores, changes to transfer orientation, and changes in priority registration. CAAC members agreed that there are too many decisions being made without consultation of the bodies/areas being impacted. CAAC members requested meeting regularly with various bodies/groups including admissions, online, AISS, CIO, strategic planning, alumni, career services, RCS, MATH, English, orientation, and possibly more.

IV. **Meeting Adjournment**