

# Annual Report 2024-2025

Students, Standards & Admissions Committee

Mark Denniston, Committee Chair  
May 9, 2025

## Table of Contents

Committee Information.....	3
Committee Accomplishments.....	7
Recommendations for Future Committee Work.....	16
Appendix A (Posting Fee policy).....	19
Appendix B (OER materials).....	23

## Committee Information

### *Membership*

Sarah Allred - Health Professions (for Shannon Smith, FA24)  
Sari Byerly – Ex Officio (Student Pathways)  
Brian Chung – Science  
Mihail (Mike) Cocos – Science  
Amie Clegg - Student  
Shelly Costley – Health Professions  
Mark Denniston – Social & Behavioral Science, Chair  
Mary Foss – Faculty Senate Executive Committee Liaison  
Marc Gangwer - Ex Officio (SAC)  
Saori Hanaki – Education  
Qi Jin - Education (for Saori Hanaki, SP25)  
Daniel (Dan) Jonas – Arts & Humanities  
Cori Horne - Ex Officio (Registrar)  
Leslie Howerton - Arts & Humanities  
Daniel Jonas – Arts & Humanities  
Justin Kani – Library  
Alvaro La Parra-Perez – Business & Economics  
Kerri Mocko - Science (for Brian Chung, SP25)  
Cass Morgan - Administration  
Austin Okelberry - Health Professions (for Shelly Costley, FA24)  
Jessica Oyler - Administration  
Brad Peterson– EAST  
Scott Teichert – Ex Officio (Admissions)  
Shannon Smith - Health Professions  
McKenzie Wood - Social & Behavioral Science, Vice-Chair

### Committee Purpose

The Students, Standards, and Admissions Committee (SSA) shall collaborate in policy development and make recommendations regarding undergraduate academic requirements for admission, degrees, and certificates, from the University and on policies pertaining to student academic conduct. SSA may advise regarding policies pertaining to general student conduct. SSA may have up to five ex officio members.

### Meeting Schedule

Fall Semester: September 20, October 25, November 22

Spring Semester: January 31, February 28, March 28

**Total Meetings: 6**

### Meeting Attendance

Member	09/20 2024	10/25 2024	11/22 2024	01/31 2025	02/28 2025	03/28 2025
Sarah Allred	NA*	Present	Present	NA*	NA*	NA*
Sari Byerly	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present
Brian Chung	Present	Present	Absent	Excused	Proxy	Excused
Mihail Cocos	Present	Absent	Present	Present	Present	Present
Amie Clegg	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present
Shelly Costley	Excused	Proxy	Proxy	Present	Present	Present
Mark Denniston	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present
Mary Foss	Present	Present	Present	Present	Excused	Absent
Marc Gangwer	Excused	Excused	Present	Excused	Present	Present
Saori Hanaki	Present	Present	Present	Proxy	Proxy	Proxy
Qi Jin	NA**	NA**	NA**	Present	Present	Present
Cori Horne	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present
Leslie Howerton	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present
Daniel Jonas	NA***	Excused	Present	Excused	Excused	Excused
Justin Kani	Present	Absent	Present	Present	Present	Excused
Alvaro LaParra-Perez	Present	Present	Absent	Present	Present	Present
Kerri Mocko	NA**	NA**	NA**	Absent	Present	Absent
Cass Morgan	Present	Present	Present	Present	Excused	Present
Austin Okelberry	NA*	Present	Present	NA*	NA*	NA*
Jessica Oyler	Present	Excused	Excused	Excused	Present	Absen
Brad Peterson	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present
Scott Teichert	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Shannon Smith	Excused	Proxy	Proxy	Present	Excused	Present
McKenzie Wood	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present

\*Sarah Allred and Austin Okelberry filled in FA24 for Shannon Smith and Shelly Costley, but they were not named yet at the September meeting.

\*\*Qi Jin and Kerri Mocko filled in for Saori Hanaki and Brian Chung, who were both on sabbatical during SP25 semester

\*\*\*Daniel (Dan) Jonas replaced Toni Assay, who retired at the end of 2024 and declined to serve. Dan was not named until October, and then I failed to invite him to SP25 meetings.

### *SSA Charges*

SSA was tasked with the following charges in 2024-25:

**Charge 1.** Review the recommendations of the Shared Governance task force related to the Students, Standards and Admissions (SSA) committee in September to prepare for a vote of the Faculty Senate on October 10th 2024 and share feedback with the Executive Committee to facilitate the vote.

**Charge 2.** Review policy changes recommended by the Registrar's Office (Ongoing).

- a. Explore options to automate the waitlist priority process to support departmental workload, increase transparency and address fairness issues.

**Charge 3.** Review policy changes as recommended by the AVP for Student Pathways. (Ongoing).

**Charge 4.** Explore issues related to Canvas testing migration fallout: Including images in exams, Accommodations for students with disabilities, Assessment, [and] Student issues.

- a. Explore Canvas add-ons that allow Testing Centers and Disability Services to access student testing accommodations without requiring access to the entire Canvas course and possible
- b. Explore University funding solutions.
- c. Explore creating a Testing Advisory Executive Committee to include members of the administration, faculty, testing services, and disability services.
- d. Explore amending the PPM to include the previously stated entities in software adoption.

**Charge 5.** Review results of the pilot program related to students' access to healthcare services in the Summer if enrolled in the Fall.

**Charge 6.** Assist the coordination across colleges and between individual College Success Teams, and Provost Office initiatives related to DFWI rates and potential bottlenecks to graduation.

**Charge 7.** Continue to work with the Affordable Course Materials Task Force to explore the cost/benefits of marking courses as no-cost or low-cost courses. Provide recommendations on WSU's institutional terms and definition(s) of OER/Affordable Educational Resources.

**Charge 8.** Explore and develop a proposal for implementing mandatory faculty advisor training and development of coordinated information flow to all faculty advisors (either directly from central WSU source, or mediated through College Student Success Committees).

- a. Review College of Science advising meeting for structure as it is run by current advisors

### *Subcommittees*

ASSA employed six subcommittees this year. Their membership was as follows:

**Charge #2 Subcommittee: Review policy changes recommended by the Registrar's Office (Ongoing)**

Saori Hanaki (Chair), Amie Clegg (Student), Mike Cocos, Shelly Costley, Cori Horne , Leslie Howerton, Qi Jin, Shannon Smith, Mark Denniston

**Charge #4 Subcommittee: Explore issues related to Canvas testing migration fallout.**

Leslie Howerton (Chair), Qi Jin (SP25), Kerri Mocko (SP25), McKenzie Wood

**Charge #5 Subcommittee: Review results of the pilot program related to students' access to healthcare services in the Summer if enrolled in the Fall.**

Mike Cocos (Chair), Amie Clegg (Student), Jessica Oyler, Shannon Smith, McKenzie Wood

**Charge #6 Subcommittee: Assist the coordination across colleges and between individual College Success Teams, and Provost Office Initiatives related to DFWI rates and potential bottlenecks to graduation.**

Alvaro LaParra-Perez (Chair), Justin Kani, Daniel Jonas, Shelly Costley, Mark Denniston

**Charge #7 Subcommittee: Continue to work with the Affordable Course Materials Task Force to explore the cost/benefits of marking courses as no-cost or low cost courses. Provide recommendations on WSU's institutional terms and definition(s) of OER/Affordable Educational Resources.**

Justin Kani (Chair), Mike Cocos, Amie Clegg (Student), McKenzie Wood

**Charge #8: Explore and develop a proposal for implementing mandatory faculty advisor training and development of coordinated information flow to all faculty advisors (either directly from central WSU source, or mediated through College Student Success Committees). a. Review College of Science advising meeting for structure as it is run by current advisors.**

Brad Peterson (Chair), Alvaro LaParra-Perez, Kerri Mocko, Cass Morgan, Sari Byerly, Mark Denniston

### *Exemplary Service/Special Assignments*

The ASSA Committee cooperated and collaborated effectively in making decisions, and were motivated to fulfill our numerous charges efficiently. Seven members—**Sari Byerly, Amie Clegg, Mark Denniston, Cori Horne, Leslie Howerton, Brad Peterson,** and **McKenzie Wood**—attended every meeting.

**Mike Cocos, Saori Hanaki, Leslie Howerton, Justin Kani, Alvaro LaParra-Perez, and Brad Peterson** chaired subcommittees to collect information and draft language to address charges for the ASSA Committee. **Brad Peterson** served as scribe for minutes for each meeting. **McKenzie Wood** served as Vice-Chair for the SSA Committee.

## Committee Accomplishments

### *2024-2025 Charges—Progress and Results*

**Charge 1: Review the recommendations of the Shared Governance task force related to the Students, Standards and Admissions (SSA) committee in September to prepare for a vote of the Faculty Senate on October 10th 2024 and share feedback with the Executive Committee to facilitate the vote.**

The SSA Committee provided feedback to Faculty Senate and the Shared Governance Task Force regarding the revised SSA Committee purpose and job description in the updated Faculty Senate Bylaws, and those recommendations were largely adopted.

**Charge 2: Review policy changes recommended by the Registrar's Office (Ongoing).**  
**a. Explore options to automate the waitlist priority process to support departmental workload, increase transparency and address fairness issues.**

Three changes to PPM (see A-C below) stemmed from this charge this year, plus a major discussion regarding waitlist and registration priority that ultimately did not lead to any policy language (part a of the charge above--see D below), and relatedly also a pledge from the Registrar to work on clarifying and communicating informal policy related to registration (see part E below).

**A) Repeated Course proposal--changes to PPM 4-19: **APPROVED** by Faculty Senate**

1) In PPM 4-19 removed the word "University" to accept transferred/accredited course to replace

i) The change is necessary to comply with USHE policy (transferred from other USHE institutions)

ii) The department still has the authority to accept or reject the transferred course for program requirements (but as a GE credit, it would be considered met)

iii) Students will not be negatively impacted

B) Recording Fees proposal--changes to PPM 6-17: **APPROVED** by Faculty Senate

See Appendix A below for text of the proposal.

C) Grade Deadlines for Block Courses--changes to PPM 4-19: **APPROVED** by Faculty Senate

- 1) The English Department requested a change through Mary Foss. Faculty Senate then approved a new change to SSA (technically not under Charge 2, since the Registrar wanted this proposal to be faculty initiated, but I tasked the Charge 2 Subcommittee to consider the change and I drafted the following proposal myself [I am not even certain if there was formal language of the new charge communicated back to us from Faculty Senate, or if it was simply approval to move ahead].
- 2) The relevant PPM is PPM 4-19.3.2, Reporting and Changing of Grades. Cori informed us that the policy gives faculty three business days after the end of finals each semester to submit grades, but importantly did not require first block grades to be submitted until the end of the semester.
- 3) I drafted, and SSA considered and approved, the following language:  
*Final grades shall be entered into the Electronic Grading System by instructors within three working days following the last scheduled day or examination (whichever comes later) of each block and semester. Departments may establish earlier grade submission deadlines for their faculty based on program need, such as for accreditation or successive courses. Upon request, the Office of the Registrar will supply the instructors with a copy of instructions for using the Electronic Grading System.*
- 4) After our proposal was uploaded to Curriculog, Stephanie Hollist (University Legal Counsel) tweaked the language before submission to and consideration by Faculty Senate (with notice to and without objection by SSA), and then the Faculty Senate approved the new policy at the March Faculty Senate meeting.

D) Waitlist and Registration Priority discussion [consideration of changes to PPM 6-3]

The Office of the Registrar had received requests over several years for priority registration from 4 different groups including: 1) Freshmen and sophomore students in the SSS (Student Support Services) and SSS-STEM; 2) Wildcat Scholars; 3) First Year Students; and 4) WSU Online. Last year ASSA assembled a subcommittee, led by Saori Hanaki, to consider what should be done with these requests.



Since implementation of new 'priority registration' requires PPM 6-3 change, 'reserved seating' and 'waitlist priority' (priority within a waitlist itself) functions were identified as more viable options. These functions can be based on major, class standing, etc. that can be set by the departments.

In Spring 2024, the Office of the Registrar secured a contract with Ferrilli Consultants and reviewed the reserved seating functionality in detail. Ferrilli Consultants were retained to help WSU address an existing Banner defect impacting this functionality.

There were months of waiting upon action by Ferrilli Consulting. Then in November 2024 Cori informed us that a workable software fix to facilitate waitlist priority would not be forthcoming:

*"Several other institutions told me that they piloted the feature and decided not to move forward with it because it was causing confusion for students. The confusion arose because the registration system will show that seats are available in a section if at least one seat is open in either the general or reserved portion of the seat totals. That means the section looks in the registration portal (in the Status column in the capture below) like there are seats available even if the only open seats are for a special population. My colleagues said this created a lot of frustration for students trying to add seats that were actually not available to them. We see something similar already with waitlist seats, as these also show open seats that are actually reserved for the next student on the waitlist. I worry that we will cause more confusion and frustration than benefit if we utilize the reserved seating feature. On top of the other issue I shared last time, wherein we cannot adjust the number of seats assigned to specific and general populations after the course is set up, I believe we are at a threshold to halt implementation until Ellucian Banner can address one or both of these issues. I am disappointed but feel it's prudent not to introduce a fault-ridden feature into the registration system. At this time, I would recommend that we instead revisit priority registration policy to determine whether [PPM 6.3-III](#) aligns with current best practices and our students' needs."*

So, following Cori's suggestion, we returned to consideration of altering PPM to expand registration priority. Brad noted in the minutes of our January SSA meeting:

*"Some groups could get grant money if they had official registration priority. PPM 6.3 III.A lists some priority. Mark suggested Wildcast Scholars (students with additional need), SSS and SSSstem (Trio student support services). They serve 150 to 200 per grant, they have been around since the 1970s, so we're thinking around 340 students. Adding it to a junior level priority group could help avoid issues with giving too many students into priority registration. We want to double check wording and idea, and we would need a clear justification why this is occurring. We also want to make sure the door isn't opened to just let more groups in. We discussed how these grants worked and the mechanics."*

The original idea for registration priority for SSS and SSS-STEM came from [WSU staff member] Gregory Christiansen who wrote the following paragraphs in Fall 2023 (I simply edited and condensed below):

*"The Student Support Services (SSS) and Student Support Services - STEM (SSS-STEM) offices are seeking to have priority registration granted to ... students enrolled in their programs.... SSS and SSS-STEM serve low-income & first generation students who have significant obstacles to persistence and graduation in addition to the normal obstacles that all students face. Our goal is to help alleviate the additional challenges that can compound an already difficult situation by enabling these students to more easily obtain a schedule that is ideal for them. ...[G]ranting this small group of students priority registration is worthy of consideration, as it has been a practice at several other Utah institutions of higher education for many years. [Reviewing] other Student Support Services-Trio programs in the state [staff has] verified that most of their institutions provide priority registration to their programs, including Southern Utah University, Utah Valley University, Utah State University, and Utah Tech University. Some of these programs do so on a case by case basis as determined by program advisors, while others have it provided to all of their students. Considering that we are an open enrollment institution that has a special place in serving the low-income/first generation community, [it is] reasonable that this is a benefit we should be providing through Student Support Services at Weber State, which specializes in assisting these students"*

Ultimately, however, Cori informed us, after meeting with her Registration team, that:

*"significant manual processes would have to be implemented to extend priority registration to students based on individual attributes that don't exist in Banner. We don't have a way to mark SSS program participation in students' Banner records, so awarding priority registration would have to be done every semester through a registration PIN on the Banner backend, which would have to be manually assigned based on lists provided each semester by SSS to the Registration team. There is a high risk of error with these kinds of manual processes, and students get extremely frustrated when they don't have the priority correctly applied. We see this issue regularly with priority areas like student-athletes, students with disabilities, and veterans, all of which DO have markers in Banner to base the priority status on, but which are not optimally reliable because the markers are applied manually in Banner by Athletics, Disability Services, and Military-Affiliated Student Center. The SSS process is likely to be significantly worse than these because we won't be able to cross-reference any information in the student record to confirm the priority status. Given that the current proposal would at most move SSS students forward one day (from sophomore to junior registration time, since we have heard these students will be continuing not incoming students), I am not sure the workload and risk of student frustration are worth the incremental change. I understand that priority registration can support grant scoring, but that was not the primary intent of the PPM charge and I am hesitant to move forward with this change if the benefit to students is not significant."*

As Charge 2 is a Registrar-initiated process, this effectively ended consideration of waitlist and registration priority for the 2024-25 academic year, although Cori remained optimistic

that eventually software updates for Banner may permit reconsideration of waitlist priority in the future.

E) Registration Policies. Cori/Registrar's Office will draft over SU25 guidelines for appropriate use of hidden sections/multiple sections to circumvent waitlist priority issues, as using hidden sections to circumvent waitlist priority (which is an artifact of registration priority) could be abused.

**Charge 2, permitting the Registrar to draft and submit policies for SSA consideration, needs to be continued (but recommend delete part a).**

**Charge 3:** Review policy changes as recommended by the AVP for Student Pathways. (Ongoing).

No specific policy changes were recommended under this charge, but many of the discussions involving Charge 8 below heavily involved our AVP for Student Pathways, Sari Byerly.

**Charge 3, permitting the AVP for Student Pathways to draft and submit policies for SSA consideration, should be continued for the 2025-26 academic year.**

**Charge 4:** Explore issues related to Canvas testing migration fallout: Including images in exams, Accommodations for students with disabilities, Assessment, [and] Student issues.

**a. Explore Canvas add-ons that allow Testing Centers and Disability Services to access student testing accommodations without requiring access to the entire Canvas course and possible**

**b. Explore University funding solutions.**

**c. Explore creating a Testing Advisory Executive Committee to include members of the administration, faculty, testing services, and disability services.**

**d. Explore amending the PPM to include the previously stated entities in software adoption.**

*The Subcommittee did not submit a final report, so below is an edited version of the subcommittee update from January:*

- The Testing Advisory Committee (TAC) met recently. SSA Subcommittee #4 is working on bringing a centralized committee for all testing issues together.
- Roy Kwon - Wants to broaden the discussion about testing from the current ad hoc system in which the TAC meets occasionally to a standing meeting format that addresses all areas of testing regularly.
- Jessica Oyler- We could shift TAC to include disability services and testing services. The group later added that we should include WSU Online and WSUSA.

- Leslie Howerton- Shared 2023-2024 report ASSA Subcommittee report assessing the Chi Tester to Canvas migration that provides faculty feedback. The ASSA subcommittee conducted a faculty survey about the migration, Canvas Quizzes, and accessibility. The report contains the raw data as well.
- Saori Hanaki - Wants a broader pilot program before testing software gets launched. WSU Online can offer training sessions for faculty that are voluntary before new software gets widely distributed.
- Jessica Oyler - Agreed with a broader pilot program for training. She suggested that maybe an opt-in pilot program for faculty would be beneficial.

As SSA Chair, I will also note Leslie Howerton organized a meeting of the various testing stakeholders across campus on April 11, 2025, which I attended. I am not certain of everyone who attended, but the meeting invite included Emily Sorenson, Tracey Smith, Oliver Snow, Angela McLean, Carl Porter [will be retiring at end of June], Pieter Sawatzki, Alema Leota, Amie Clegg [SSA student representative], Bethany Powell, and Jaed Norberg. The purpose of this meeting- was to brainstorm how to consolidate and create a standing committee of key testing stakeholders across campus, including WSU Online, Disability Services, Testing Services, student representatives and the key administrators responsible for the various offices and staff responsible for testing. That meeting emphasized the importance of testing coordination, and that significant changes to Proctorio and other testing related services are under consideration or in the works, and having a mechanism to share information across stakeholders and faculty is vitally necessary.

**Charge 5: Review results of the pilot program related to students' access to healthcare services in the Summer if enrolled in the Fall.**

The Charge 5 Subcommittee worked with Jessica Oyler to ensure students will have full access to healthcare during the summer, even if they are not enrolled in summer classes but enrolled for the fall.

1. **Usage Data:**
  - **AY 23-24:** 128 visits by 111 unique students.
  - **AY 24-25:** 263 visits by 212 unique students.
2. **Cost Implications:**
  - The total cost increased by \$25,510 compared to last summer.
  - We find this increase reasonable and suggest that they will continue using the clinic service in the future based on this trend.

Jessica Oyler gave a report at the November 2024 Faculty Senate Meeting as part of the Administrative Update, embracing the pilot study results and adopting this as a permanent change.

**Charge 6: Assist the coordination across colleges and between individual College Success Teams, and Provost Office initiatives related to DFWI rates and potential bottlenecks to graduation.**

After several meetings to understand the initiatives in place for DFWI (especially in the context of the College Success Teams -CST), the subcommittee could finally attend the CST meeting on March 27, 2025. We observed that each college is already pursuing tailored strategies to help with their DFWI. For example, the College of Science has been working on contacting students before the class cancellation deadline and reaching out to them more efficiently through Starfish to ensure they know their options and standings. Arts and Humanities talks to each department to identify the causes of higher DFWI rates in some courses. On a related note, they are working on enhancing and ensuring Canvas consistency by having a "Canvas Consistency Fellow Role" for online courses. The goal is to create sandboxes, work with WSU online, and provide better resources for the Canvas websites to improve the students' experience. Social and Behavioral Sciences shares a DFWI document during the college's opening meeting each academic year. The document mentions several strategies that help address DFWI rates. The college has identified some students taking courses that are inappropriate for their semester, impacting their chances of DFWI. The School of Business and Economics created a student-led tutoring center that works well for students who need help in their courses.

During the meeting, the team also learned more about a dashboard created by Daniel Jensen and his team. The dashboard is available to everyone on the "Course Info Dashboard." Daniel Jensen's office offered training last semester (both in person and via Zoom). Training can be accessed for registration [at the WSU data training website](#). The dashboard offers the option to specify DFWI rates at the CRN level.

The dashboard seemed an intriguing (and not widely known) resource. Perhaps the main recommendation from this subcommittee would be to contact Daniel Jensen to ensure WSU faculty members are periodically reminded about its existence and possibilities. This does not seem substantial enough for the charge to continue in the fall, but a minimal follow-up with Jensen would be to think about the potential of spreading the information widely among WSU community members.

**Charge 7: Continue to work with the Affordable Course Materials Task Force to explore the cost/benefits of marking courses as no-cost or low-cost courses. Provide recommendations on WSU's institutional terms and definition(s) of OER/Affordable Educational Resources.**

In collaboration with the Affordable Materials Task Force one of the group's main accomplishments was reaching consensus on a general definition of OER and low-cost.

The definitions can be found in Appendix B below.

It is recommended that this charge continue. We recommend that the committee continue its work next year to ensure further progress on defining and implementing course designations related to affordable materials. Additionally we suggest that results from the student Survey on Affordability (launched in Spring 2025) be reviewed and considered when refining course designations.

We also recommend that the committee continue working closely with the Affordable Course Materials Task Force to maintain effective policy recommendations at the university level. This includes exploring the cost/benefits of marking courses as no-cost or low-cost and providing institutional definitions of Open Educational Resources (OER) and Affordable Educational Resources.

**Charge 8: Explore and develop a proposal for implementing mandatory faculty advisor training and development of coordinated information flow to all faculty advisors (either directly from central WSU source, or mediated through College Student Success Committees).**

**a. Review College of Science advising meeting for structure as it is run by current advisors.**

Starting early Fall 24, Subcommittee Chair Brad Peterson had conversations with many stakeholders and identified the following problems:

- Faculty advisor training and tracking is haphazard or nonexistent.
- Often faculty are given the role of advisor and only have their prior university experience to guide them.
- New advising information does not formally disseminate.
- Learning via word of mouth tends to be used most by faculty advisors.
- Finding advising documents is harder as documents are spread around.
- No shared repository for advisors to share files.
- Northwest would like us to have a formal process in place.

The first stakeholders consulted were with staff advisors in College of Science (Monica Linford and Emily Romo-Hendrix) and EAST advisors. We found broad agreement in most items with a handful of issues not fully resolved. Brad then chatted with UAAC co-chairs Aimee Golden and Diego Dominguez. Again we found broad agreement with a proposed framework with some minor issues. Brad reviewed ideas with Sari Byerly (Assistant Vice President for Student Pathways), Cori Home (Registrar), and SSA committee. From here, Jessica Oyler strongly supported the proposed framework. Brad reviewed these in SSA which continued to refine items. We heard from other advisors across campus that there are no significant objections. We eventually reached conclusions for a framework.

The agreed-upon framework recognizes that faculty advisors across campus have extremely varied responsibilities, ranging from simple mentors, to advising a few students within majors, to responsibilities close to that of staff advisors. This framework does not



change that. Sari Byerly's office would maintain a list of who is a faculty advisor. So far, she has a list of about 166 faculty advisors on campus, but this is not the complete list.

Sari's office would create and manage a Canvas training course. Faculty and staff would share the initial basic training. Faculty advisors could access all remaining staff training modules. The faculty advisor training covers a list of roughly 21 items, asynchronous instruction for 120 minutes (includes quiz assessments), and mandatory synchronous conversation to answer questions. A training trial run should happen before it is sent out to all faculty advisors university wide. Weber has hired an individual who would help create and maintain this. Advising tools cannot be granted to faculty until they have completed both this advisor training and any Registrar's additional CatTracks training. (Currently that is three small CatTracks training modules.) The Registrar confirmed that the only faculty who should have access to CatTracks features are also advisors. Thus, the Registrar can verify all training is complete before unlocking access. Sari and Cori want training integrated so faculty advisors aren't bounced around. The prior points imply that faculty who already have access to these items would not have them taken away. While we would call the training mandatory for faculty advisors, there would be no loss of access or penalty for existing advisors who do not complete this training. For new faculty advisors, they must complete their training for access.

Faculty advisors would be part of an email group for communication. New policies, announcements, etc., would go through that. Faculty advisors would also have access to past communication (perhaps as a large running website or accessible through a repository of prior messages). Sari has volunteered to administer this, and she has already begun to send out weekly announcements.

A document storage area is needed. Among Google Drive, Box, and Canvas, Google Drive had the most support due to accessibility and security. But this may change as it is implemented. All advisors could access and update. A proper folder structure for organization is critical. This framework understands that, like most document storages, some old items will accumulate and will need to be cleaned over time. Thus, items in this folder should not be viewed as authoritative, but helpful for ease of document access.

The university would not and should not be required to cover college or department specific advising training. Advisor training at these levels is their responsibility. Email communication also does not cover college or department specific items. The Canvas training may include college or faculty specific modules. The Google Drive folder may include documents at these levels.

### **Subcommittee Recommendation:**

The charge only needs verification that it is complete. Sari Byerly is responsible for direct or coordinated implementation of all these items. The charge should then remain until all items are implemented. The charge could also be updated with new verbiage: "Verify implementation of mandatory faculty advisor training and development of coordinated information flow to all faculty advisors."

## Recommendations for Future SSA Committee Work

### **Charge 2. Review policy changes recommended by the Registrar's Office (Ongoing)**

Keep—this has been a longstanding and successful ongoing charge with typically 1-3 action items/PPM changes coming from this Charge each academic year.

### **Charge 3: Review policy changes as recommended by the AVP for Student Pathways. (Ongoing).**

Keep—advising related matters are an essential aspect of the work of the SSA Committee.

### **Charge 4: Explore issues related to Canvas testing migration fallout: Including images in exams, Accommodations for students with disabilities, Assessment, [and] Student issues.**

- a. Explore Canvas add-ons that allow Testing Centers and Disability Services to access student testing accommodations without requiring access to the entire Canvas course and possible**
- b. Explore University funding solutions.**
- c. Explore creating a Testing Advisory Executive Committee to include members of the administration, faculty, testing services, and disability services.**
- d. Explore amending the PPM to include the previously stated entities in software adoption**

It is anticipated that this charge not be renewed (being several years old), BUT Leslie Howerton plans to continue on chairing an Ad Hoc Group of the Testing Stakeholders across campus into Academic Year 2025-26 (including a tentative May meeting yet this year), although she has completed her term with the SSA Committee. It is unclear how this ad hoc committee should relate to Faculty Senate--should it 1) coordinate with and provide reports to SSA, or 2) report directly to Faculty Senate Executive Committee, or 3) be considered an administrative ad hoc committee that should be funded and report to some authority in WSU Administration, or 4) have some other official capacity? It was suggested that this ad hoc committee include membership from several Faculty Senate committees, including a student representative from SSA, and also members from the Committee on Teaching and Learning, and possibly also the Assessment Committee.



**Charge 7:** Continue to work with the Affordable Course Materials Task Force to explore the cost/benefits of marking courses as no-cost or low-cost courses. Provide recommendations on WSU's institutional terms and definition(s) of OER/Affordable Educational Resources.

**a. Collect data on the effect of current designations on WSU student registration and enrollment. Make a formal recommendation on a no/low cost designator for WSU.**

It is recommended that this charge continue. We recommend that the committee continue its work next year to ensure further progress on defining and implementing course designations related to affordable materials. Additionally, we suggest that results from the student Survey on Affordability (launched in Spring 2025) be reviewed and considered when refining course designations.

We also recommend that the committee continue working closely with the Affordable Course Materials Task Force to maintain effective policy recommendations at the university level. This includes exploring the cost/benefits of marking courses as no-cost or low-cost and providing institutional definitions of Open Educational Resources (OER) and Affordable Educational Resources.

**Charge 8:** Explore and develop a proposal for implementing mandatory faculty advisor training and development of coordinated information flow to all faculty advisors (either directly from central WSU source, or mediated through College Student Success Committees).

**a. Review College of Science advising meeting for structure as it is run by current advisors.**

The charge only needs verification that it is complete. Sari Byerly is responsible for direct or coordinated implementation of all these items. The charge should then remain until all items are implemented. The charge could also be updated with new verbiage: "Verify implementation of mandatory faculty advisor training and development of coordinated information flow to all faculty advisors."

**Chair's Thoughts on Additional Charges:** In addition to the recommendations listed above from the various subcommittees regarding SSA's charges for 2024-25, the Chair provides notes here of other discussions of tasks SSA has discussed in the past or maybe called upon to consider in the future:

1) [Stephanie Hollist](#) informed me in Spring 2025 that there may need to be changes to the WSU Student Code to make it compliant with state and federal language. These changes would need to formally go through the Student Code amendment process (but hopefully these will be fairly straight-forward changes, without any calls for the optional amendment hearings conducted by the SSA Committee).

2) Assist with creation of recommended format and rules for hearings considering amendments to Student Code. SSA should follow up with [Stephanie Hollist](#) who is spearheading this--I recommend these hearings should be conducted in person, with a Zoom option, and be generally along the lines of a city council meeting with the ability of audience members to address the committee members, and committee members can ask questions of each other and other members of the WSU community.

3) The SSA Committee might consider adding a fifth ex officio member (authorized under By-Laws) to assist with the new charges for 2025-26. Identifying a fifth ex officio member each year to assist with the largest and most complicated charges for that year was SSA ex-officio member Scott Teichert's idea when the number of authorized ex officio members for SSA was increased in the By-Laws a few years ago. For 2025-26, this might be someone connected to the OER process, since that charge has been renewed several times, or someone with needed expertise for one of the other charges.

4) It is perhaps implicit in Charge 2 above, but revisiting issues of waitlist priority and registration policies (see parts D and E above under Charge 2 discussion) at the appropriate time could be prudent. I usually think of Charge 2 as Registrar initiated proposals and discussion, BUT if these issues are deemed important by Faculty Senate then registration and waitlist priority issues could be included in formal charges from Faculty Senate (and then not be tabled or withdrawn, as I considered the waitlist priority to be effectively tabled once Cori communicated her concerns about continuing to move forward at this time).

5) Finally, during the 2023-24 academic year the Committee identified the Provost Office's Conflict of Interest Form as a key tool to address the then charge for faculty-authored textbooks. We confirmed the existence of the form in January 2024, but at that time it was only sent to new employees. The form collects data on faculty-authored materials and their handling of conflicts of interest. We recommended expanding the form's use to all faculty members to enhance data collection and promote faculty awareness of conflict-of-interest issues. After the new Provost begins, it would be helpful to follow up with them to discuss the option of distributing the form among WSU faculty members on a regular basis.

## **Appendix A:**

### **ASSA Charge 24-25: PPM 6-17, Recording Fee**

Policy Title: PPM 6-17, Recording Fee

Policy Sponsor: Cori Horne, University Registrar

Responsible Offices: Registrar's Office, Admissions Office, Cashier's Office

#### **Summary**

Currently, students who receive prior learning credit at Weber State have multiple steps before credit is applied. After submitting their scores, they must complete a paper copy of an application for test credit to request that the credit be recorded on their transcript. Then, they must call or visit the Cashier's Office to pay a \$10 recording fee. Students will often submit test scores but fail to go through the next steps because they either get lost in the shuffle or are unaware of how to complete this process. Because the credit is not reflected on their transcript or CatTracks degree audit, some then go on to take an equivalent course to complete a requirement that would already have been completed by the prior learning credit. This can frustrate students, cost them unnecessary tuition, and delay their degree completion.

The Registrar's Office is proposing a streamlined process that removes the recording fee for AP and CLEP exam credit, allowing test credit to be applied automatically upon receipt in the Admissions Office. Students would not have to submit an application for test credit nor connect with the Cashier's Office to make a payment.

This change would only affect AP and CLEP scores, for which exam equivalencies are set in USHE Majors Meetings. For other types of prior learning credit that require review of individual student records by faculty articulators, the recording fee will remain in place.

#### **Impact on the University & Implementation Steps**

Removal of the recording fee would positively impact students with only a small loss in revenue for the university. Without the payment step, the process to record prior learning test credit would require no bandwidth from students and less time and coordination between university offices. Students' test credit would be applied in a timely fashion, improving the accuracy of their CatTracks degree audit and academic advisement. This in turn would ensure that students do not register for unneeded coursework, saving them time and money as they complete their degrees.

The policy change would result in lost revenue of around \$8,000 a year (see annual revenue, 2019 to 2023, in chart below). This money currently goes to general funds rather than any specific programming, and could be offset by increased tuition revenue from the university's record enrollment this year.

## SSA Committee Annual Report 2024-2025

	Academic Year									
	2019		2020		2021		2022		2023	
Fee Description	Total	# Students	Total	# Students	Total	# Students	Total	# Students	Total	# Students
CLEP Recording Fee	\$260	24	\$200	20	\$190	18	\$150	15	\$190	18
AP Recording Fee	\$8,970	898	\$8,200	821	\$7,580	756	\$8,250	828	\$7,740	777

Potential Stakeholders: Bursar, Financial Services, Budget Office, academic departments, academic advisors

### Current Policy

#### I. POLICY:

There will be a recording fee for credit hour transactions to a student's permanent transcript other than those involving course work completed at Weber State University. Therefore, when credit hours are recommended and approved for the following types of credit, the fee will be charged.

A. Military credit evaluated by either the director of admissions or that recommended by a department chairperson.

B. Nontraditional experience evaluated and recommended for credit by a department chairperson.

C. Training programs at nonaccredited institutions of either an academic or vocational nature as evaluated and recommended for credit by a department chairperson (including foreign institutions).

D. Special Examination credit.

E. College Level Examination credit.

F. Advanced Placement Examination credit.

G. Other.

#### II. PROCEDURE:

- A. The student will pick up recording fee application at the graduation window.
- B. The application should be properly completed and presented to the Cashier's Office for payment.
- C. The receipted application will then be attached to the approved request for credit.
- D. The student will present the receipted recording fee application and the approved request for credit to the Records Office for processing.

### **Redlined Policy**

#### **I. POLICY:**

There will be a recording fee for credit hour transactions to a student's permanent transcript other than those involving course work completed at Weber State University **for credit requiring review of individual student records**. Therefore, when credit hours are recommended and approved for the following types of credit, the fee will be charged.

- A. Military credit evaluated by either the director of admissions or that recommended by a department chairperson.
- B. Nontraditional experience evaluated and recommended for credit by a department chairperson.
- C. Training programs at nonaccredited institutions of either an academic or vocational nature as evaluated and recommended for credit by a department chairperson (including foreign institutions).
- D. Special Examination credit.

~~E. College Level Examination credit.~~

~~F. Advanced Placement Examination credit.~~

G. Other.

#### **II. PROCEDURE:**

- A. The student will pick up recording fee application at the graduation window.
- B. The application should be properly completed and presented to the Cashier's Office for payment.
- C. The receipted application will then be attached to the approved request for credit.
- D. The student will present the receipted recording fee application and the approved request for credit to the Records Office for processing.

**Clean Copy**

**I. POLICY:**

There will be a recording fee for credit hour transactions to a student's permanent transcript other than those involving course work completed at Weber State University for credit requiring review of individual student records. Therefore, when credit hours are recommended and approved for the following types of credit, the fee will be charged.

A. Military credit evaluated by either the director of admissions or that recommended by a department chairperson.

B. Nontraditional experience evaluated and recommended for credit by a department chairperson.

C. Training programs at nonaccredited institutions of either an academic or vocational nature as evaluated and recommended for credit by a department chairperson (including foreign institutions).

D. Special Examination credit.

E. Other.

**II. PROCEDURE:**

A. The student will pick up recording fee application at the graduation window.

B. The application should be properly completed and presented to the Cashier's Office for payment.

C. The receipted application will then be attached to the approved request for credit.

D. The student will present the receipted recording fee application and the approved request for credit to the Records Office for processing.

## Appendix B:

### WSU's institutional terms and definition(s) of OER/Affordable Educational Resources.

- A **No-Cost Materials** designator would be assigned to courses with required materials that were entirely free to students. Possible designator abbreviation: NCM
- A **Low-Cost Materials** designator would be assigned to courses where the total cost for required materials is less than \$40\*. Possible designator abbreviation: LCM
  - o \*Note: In looking at large state-wide affordability efforts such as in California, Hawaii, and Oregon, determining the threshold for qualifying as Low Cost is often decided individually by institution even when the efforts are coordinated at a consortial level. Found thresholds ranged from \$20-50, with \$40 being the most common.
- **"Materials,"** in the context of discussing course designations, are defined as digital and print textbooks, other text-based materials, course packets, workbooks, lab manuals, online homework platforms, and access codes or other publisher-provided curricular materials for students.
  - o Excluded from the no-cost and low-cost caps are: equipment, such as art supplies, calculators, or physical lab materials, and fees for online test proctoring or online labs.

Additional definitions for clarity in the discussion of course material affordability and possible course marking:

- **Open Educational Resources (OER)** are learning materials that carry an open license that allows others to reuse, retain, revise, remix, and redistribute content without prior permission from the creator. Some examples of OER licenses are select Creative Commons licenses (not all licenses allow revision) and GNU General Public Licenses (for software). OER are very often free to access but some may still carry a cost.
- **Affordable Educational Resources (AER)** are learning materials that have little-to-no cost to students. This can include OER as well as other traditionally copyrighted materials such as library resources (databases, journals, ebooks), free-to-access online content, and also other materials with total costs lower than a threshold decided by an institution.