

Section I

Name of Committee: Student Faculty Policy Committee

Submitted by: Whitney Hansen

Date Submitted: 4/17/2024

Membership Roster: Whitney Hansen, John Dallmus, Donald Frost, Anne Walton-Ramirez, Bjorg LeSueur, Shanondora Billiot, Yun Kang, Douglas Wilkey, Roseanne Schuster, Debbie Ritter-Williams, Daniel McCarville

Overview Narrative:

The Student Faculty Policy Committee (SFPC) met seven times this year and reviewed seven RFCs, which are described in detail below. In addition to the plenary committee meetings, each member of the SFPC was on one or more subcommittee(s), which met as needed throughout the year. Our committee members also met with members of administration, faculty and students across all four campuses, and Senate leadership to gather information related to our RFCs. The result was a productive year with many successful outcomes. Of these seven RFCs, one was transferred to another committee, three were closed, and three will continue in the 2024/2025 academic year. One motion was sent to the Senate for voting in the 24/25 year. Recommendations for other RFCs are listed in sections II, and III.

Section II

Request for Consultations and/or topics reviewed by the committee and outcomes (topics reviewed by the committee decided not to act/review should be listed here with, no action taken):

RFC 248 – Classroom Scheduling

Issue: Review the current model for classroom scheduling. The current schedule for classes (T/TH, MWF, MW afternoons) is restrictive and leads to a variety of challenges. It is difficult to find classroom spaces on campus, especially at Tempe and Polytechnic. Additionally, buses are full, parking is difficult, and food services are overwhelmed on T/TH, when most courses are scheduled.

Actions: Reviewed the RFC and discussed with the Executive Committee to determine if SFPC was the right place for this RFC. A more appropriate place might be the Facilities Committee.

Office of the University Senate

Outcome: The Senate Executive Committee, members of the SFPC, and Johannah Uriri-Glover, Chair of the Facilities Committee, agreed that the Facilities Committee would take over this RFC. The SFPC closed it at the December 11, 2023 meeting.

RFC 245 – Non-grade grievance policies:

Issue: Are there systematic policies across the University that students/faculty/administrators should follow when a student has a grievance that is not related to their grade?

Action: The subcommittee searched for policies and contacted administrators in various Colleges and Schools to determine if procedures exist. The [College of Health Solutions](#) has a documented, consistent procedure, but others do not. We heard from several administrative leaders that the process is not formalized in their units.

Outcome: The committee recommends that other Colleges/Schools follow the lead of CHS and create and document consistent policies for non-grade grievances. This will ensure due process for the students and faculty involved. The recommended motion is below:

Undergraduate Students who have a grievance that is not related to their grade may file a complaint by following the steps below. Non-grade grievances may include dissatisfaction with an instructor, problems with a classmate, or other unresolved situations. If the issue involves a possible violation of Title IX, the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities or the [Office of University Rights and Responsibilities](#) should be contacted as appropriate.

Step 1: The student contacts the instructor to describe the reason for the grievance. The student and faculty meet to discuss. If this does not resolve the issue, move on to step 2

Step 2: The student contacts the appropriate leadership in the Unit to discuss the grievance. If the issue is not resolved, move on to step 3.

Step 3: The student meets with the appropriate College or School leader. If the issue is unresolved, the College or School leadership may contact the Dean of Students or other ASU leadership.

On 4/1/2024, the committee voted 11 - 0 to close this RFC and send the motion to the Senate.

RFC 263 – Course withdrawal policies:

Issue: A graduate student withdrew from a course and was surprised when the course materials were no longer available. The student requested that these procedures be clarified.

Actions: The committee reviewed current withdrawal policies as stated in SSM 201-08. The committee felt this policy was sufficiently clear about the outcome when students withdraw from a course. The committee also reached out to an Academic Advisor in The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to see if this is a frequently occurring complaint from students. The answer was no. As a result, the committee felt this was not a problem in need of a solution.

Outcome: On 4/1/2024, by a vote of 11-0, the committee decided to close this RFC.

Office of the University Senate

Interdisciplinary B Room 361
PO Box 871703 Tempe, AZ 85287-1703
480-965-2222 Fax: 480-965-0814
usenate.asu.edu

RFC 237 - Accessibility

Issue: A student group, The Accessibility Coalition, requested an RFC in August 2022 to explore issues related to accommodations on campus. There were four major issues: faculty not providing accommodations, delayed access and slow response times from SAILS accessibility consultants, student events that are inaccessible, and discrimination from other students. In the 22-23 year, the committee met with a variety of people at ASU to learn more about accessibility, including the Director of SAILS and the Supervisor of Accessibility Consultants at SAILS. To learn about accessibility in textbooks and other academic resources, they met with an Associate University Librarian and manager of the ASU Bookstore. They also met with the Executive Director for Disability Resources and Chief Accessibility Officer at the University of Arizona, to determine how other Pac-12 schools handle accessibility. The 22/23 committee recommended that the 23/24 committee continue with their work, focusing on student events and continuing discussions with SAILS.

In an attempt to provide cohesion for this RFC and effectively summarize the work from the 22/23 and the 23/24 academic years, we have chosen to organize our report by the four initial issues that were outlined in the RFC.

Actions: The first issue raised in the RFC stated that faculty do not always provide accommodations. To investigate this claim, we asked Alicia Wackerly-Painter and Chad Price if they had any data about how often faculty fail to provide accommodations. They stated that denial of accommodations rarely happens, but when it does, SAILS will provide support to any student who wants to file a grade grievance. They also stated that students and faculty may disagree on what is appropriate accommodation for a course, and SAILS consultants work with both parties to ensure a fair resolution. To that end, SAILS upgraded their software in the 23/24 year, and the new system provides students and faculty with greater transparency and easier access. One noteworthy update is the FlexPlan, which is critical for students who have flexible attendance or flexible deadline accommodations. The Flexplan facilitates communication between the faculty and student as they decide how to manage this accommodation in each course. Finally, SAILS has increased the number of trainings it provides for faculty and staff. These trainings provide a space for faculty to learn, ask questions, and generally discuss accommodations, which should lead to improved implementation of accommodations. Unfortunately, most faculty are unaware of these trainings and it would be useful if they could be advertised systematically. Currently, advertising occurs via emails, but many faculty members report that they do not receive them.

The second claim in the RFC was that SAILS does not consistently provide adequate support to students. The committee conducted an analysis of financial resources allocated to SAILS during the 2022/2023 academic year, comparing it with similar institutions like the University of Arizona (U of A). This examination revealed significant differences in funding and caseload management. Specifically, in the 2022-2023 academic year, U of A had about 4,000 registered students with 9-10 accessibility consultants, while ASU had 8,000-10,000 registered students and 10 - 12 consultants. This means the caseload at ASU is double that of the U of A consultants. To address the issue of funding and caseloads, the committee recommends close monitoring of financial resources that may reduce caseloads and/or increase funding as necessary.

Office of the University Senate

Interdisciplinary B Room 361
PO Box 871703 Tempe, AZ 85287-1703
480-965-2222 Fax: 480-965-0814
usenate.asu.edu

Students also reported long wait times to meet with their accessibility consultants. According to Alicia Wackerly-Painter, SAILS has vacancies and stated that they have had difficulty filling those positions. This compounds existing staffing challenges. While EOSS made some salary changes, they were not substantial enough to resolve the staffing issues. The committee suggested exploring reasons for low applicant interest, such as the requirement for in-office and in-person work, and considering alternative funding sources beyond ASU's direct allocation, such as seeking more foundation grants. Moreover, there is a need to address the imbalance of responsibility where colleges benefit from SAILS' work without contributing to its costs, which could be addressed through revised funding models or increased collaboration between SAILS and academic departments.

The third issue in the RFC is related to events. The committee met with Briane Fraizer, Director of Student Success at SkySong (EdPlus), representing online students, and Courtney Smith, Director of Student Connection & Community for Tempe, representing on-campus students. The committee learned that Student Connection & Community (Tempe) and counterparts on each campus register and advise student clubs in planning events in terms of facilitating accessibility. One challenge is that student organizations only have the funding they think to ask for. This has come up infrequently, and student clubs can reach out to Student Connection & Community to help navigate ad-hoc. Brianne's team has made progress in accessibility by making key events available online, such as streaming fall welcome speakers and concerts. Recommendations for student organizations include connecting with Student Connection & Community for help implementing policies and resources to do this and raising concerns with the Sun Devil Leadership Council, which includes premier student organizations, including the Accessibility Coalition.

The committee also contacted the MLK Student-Servant Leadership Award committee to convey student concerns about the in-person awards attendance requirement. That requirement was removed for the MLK Student-Servant Leadership Award, which addresses the specific issue in the complaint.

The fourth issue was related to student discrimination of SAILS students. As this is an issue of Student Conduct, it is out of our committee's purview.

Outcome: To summarize, the committee felt the RFC had been sufficiently explored, and many issues had been addressed or resolved. To address ongoing issues, we make the following recommendations:

- Increase advertising of SAILS training for faculty
- Reduce caseloads for accessibility consultants.
- Evaluate hiring plans and compensation packages for accessibility consultants.
- Encourage student groups to think proactively about accessibility needs and apply for appropriate funding.

On 4/8/2024 the committee voted 7 - 0 to close this RFC.

Office of the University Senate

Interdisciplinary B Room 361
PO Box 871703 Tempe, AZ 85287-1703
480-965-2222 Fax: 480-965-0814
usenate.asu.edu

Section III

Request for Consultations and/or topics that were not started or remain unfinished and need to be carried over to the next academic year.

RFC 261 - Cintana

Issue: ASU has a partnership with Cintana, a for-profit, public benefit corporation that connects Universities around the world with ASU knowledge, courses, and educational innovation. Faculty throughout ASU have received requests for their online courses to be added to a content repository (CR) for Cintana and its partners. As this is a new partnership, faculty have questions and concerns about the relationship and the CR. Some specific concerns include:

- 1) a lack transparency about the Cintana/ASU relationship, generally;
- 2) questions about the process for identifying and moving courses into the CR;
- 3) questions about the rights that faculty and units have when their courses are added into the CR;
- 3) if there are revenue sharing options or other compensation for faculty/units whose content is added to the repository.

Actions: This is a shared RFC between SFPC and the Personnel committee. A subcommittee comprising members of both committees was formed and met with faculty across the four campuses to hear their experiences and concerns. Similar themes emerged from these discussions, which related to academic integrity, safety, cultural sensitivity, fairness, compensation, course/impact tracking, and course modifications. The subcommittee met with Gemma Garcia, Executive Director, Learning Technology, Office of the Provost and point person for the content repository, and Julia Rosen, Vice President of Global Academic Initiatives, Office of the Provost, to discuss some initial concerns. Gemma Garcia and Julia Rosen then spoke to the entire Senate at our March 25, 2024 meeting and provided an overview of the partnership. The subcommittee plans to continue discussions with ASU leadership in the next academic year so that additional questions and concerns about the content repository can be raised and solutions found.

Outcome: On 4/8/2024 the committee voted 7 - 0 to continue this RFC. Goals for 2024/25 include:

- Work with administration to increase transparency about the CR
- Research faculty rights and responsibilities as related to the CR
- Research concerns related to academic integrity, privacy, and copyrights.
- Work with the Personnel committee to ensure that faculty interests (credit, compensation, etc.) are considered in this partnership

RFC 244 - Academic Integrity

Issue: Matters involving Academic Integrity (ACI) at ASU are consistently in flux. RFC 244 is designed to be broad in scope and provide the SFPC with an appropriate degree of flexibility in addressing this ever-changing landscape.

Office of the University Senate

Interdisciplinary B Room 361
PO Box 871703 Tempe, AZ 85287-1703
480-965-2222 Fax: 480-965-0814
usenate.asu.edu

Actions: During the current Senate term, in the context of RFC 244, the SFPC addressed the following:

- Continued use/abuse of third-party websites by students.
- The potential impact of the burgeoning use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) engines (e.g. ChatGPT) on ACI, including consideration of tools to help mitigate the unauthorized use and/or abuse of AI (e.g. Turnitin).
- Through the use of surveys and interviews, the continued exploration and analysis of the uniformity of ACI policies (including sanctions resulting from violations thereof) across the various ASU academic units.
- Continued discussion with ASU management regarding existing University ACI resources/policies, including enhanced dissemination to faculty of information pertaining to such ACI resources.
- Investigation into deficiencies discovered in the Honorlock remote proctoring system. This item was subsequently transferred to [RFC 265](#).

Outcome: Looking forward, the SFPC believes RFC 244 continues to offer a viable vehicle for ongoing investigation and monitoring of ACI issues. All the items listed above (save RFC 265) warrant further consideration as research continues and additional information becomes available. The SFPC also believes collaboration/cooperation with other Senate standing committees (such as the Digitally Enhanced Teaching and Learning Committee) may be appropriate for certain matters. Accordingly, on 4/8/2024 the committee voted 8 - 0 to continue this RFC.

RFC 265 - Honorlock

Issue: A material weakness in the HonorLock virtual proctoring system's functionality was discovered during the Spring 2024 term. Students are able to use a simple keystroke to take a screengrab during exams, essentially copying exam questions and saving them in Dropbox for later. HonorLock indicated the first reported issue was associated with a new print screen feature introduced by Dropbox in October, 2023. It was also discovered that the Honorlock system allowed a student to capture an image of an exam question through the normal print screen functionality of the Apple MacBook operating system.

Actions: John Dallmus, a member of this subcommittee and the discoverer of this problem, immediately reported the issue to W.P. Carey senior leadership, who then reported it to ASU Enterprise Technology. The latter then raised the issue with Honorlock. Due to concerns with Honorlock's responsiveness to the issue and their approach to addressing it, John met with people from Learning Experience, Academic Technology Support, and Proctoring Support at ASU to receive status and gain insights. Through this meeting, he learned HonorLock was beta testing a two pronged solution. The Honorlock system will generate a "Hotkeys Detected" flag and blur the captured image when print screen related keystrokes are detected. This will be done every time a student attempts to copy a question within an exam, which ensures (through captured image blurring) no useful images of exam content can be obtained.

Office of the University Senate

Interdisciplinary B Room 361
PO Box 871703 Tempe, AZ 85287-1703
480-965-2222 Fax: 480-965-0814
usenate.asu.edu

ASU's Director of Learning Experience Environments, Ruvi Wijesuriya, stated he will request the HonorLock system be programmed to display a message indicating something along the lines of "An attempt to screen capture exam content has been detected, which is prohibited. This incident has been recorded and reported to your instructor." While the blurring of captured images will prevent intelligible exam content from being obtained throughout an entire exam session, displaying the aforementioned message should result in students ceasing to copy exam questions after their first attempt to do so. Therefore, it is thought that this combined approach (image blurring and a warning message) makes live proctor intervention unnecessary. The committee agreed that this two-pronged approach should be sufficient.

Outcome: On 4/8/2024 the committee voted 8 - 0 to continue this RFC. Goals for 24/25 include:

- Monitor the implementation of Honorlock's solutions.
- Evaluate the efficacy of Honorlock's solutions.
- Evaluate procedures for review and adoption of enterprise-scale proctoring solutions.

Section IV

Recommendations to the Senate or Final Comments

Recommendations are listed for each RFC in sections II and III.

This committee continues to be one of the busiest standing committees and this year was no exception. Thank you to the committee members for their hard work, thoughtful discussions, and camaraderie.

Please type a summary in 100 words or less in this space. This paragraph will be cut and pasted directly into the Senate Annual Report.

This year, the SFPC worked on several issues related to academic integrity, including inconsistencies across units and deficiencies in Honorlock. As of this writing, Honorlock has committed to modifications that should address these inadequacies. We evaluated concerns with SAILS brought by a student group in 2022. We researched non-grade related grievance policies and made a recommendation for a University-wide approach, which would ensure due process for all students, faculty, and administrators. We began reviewing ASU's relationship with Cintana and will continue to work with administration to ensure that the partnership is transparent and fair for faculty.

Office of the University Senate

Interdisciplinary B Room 361
PO Box 871703 Tempe, AZ 85287-1703
480-965-2222 Fax: 480-965-0814
usenate.asu.edu