

**2013-14 Academic Affairs Board Chair's Report**  
prepared by Will Polik, 4/29/14

The 2013-14 Academic Affairs Board (AcAB) membership consisted of Will Polik (Chair), Gabe Southard (Secretary), Rich Ray (Provost), Steve Bouma-Prediger (Associate Dean of Teaching and Learning), Nicki Flinn (Assessment Committee liaison), Andrew Dell'Olio (International Education Committee liaison), Steve Hoogerwerf (Library Committee liaison), Miguel Abrahantes (Curriculum Committee liaison), Pam Koch (Cultural Affairs Committee and Academic Computing Committee liaisons), Vicki-Lynn Holmes (Teacher Education Council liaison), Hannah McShane (student), Grace Blank (student), Sarah Fodor (student), Mariana Thomas (student, fall semester), Jay Glover (student, fall semester), and Tim Cook (student, spring semester). We also benefitted from significant participation by Carol De Jong (Registrar), Courtney Werner (Director of College Writing), and Ryan White (Director of FYS Program and Advising).

**Overview**

The 2013-14 Academic Affairs Board accomplished the following activities:

1. AcAB conducted a survey of Hope faculty to determine the most important factors impacting our academic program that require discussion and/or change.
2. AcAB enacted a policy for approving "zero-credit courses," allowing for experiential learning (research, ensembles, and performances) to appear on student transcripts.
3. AcAB affirmed that the definition of a credit hour applies to all delivery modalities (e.g., in-person, online, and hybrid courses).
4. AcAB met with Student Congress to learn about student concerns.
5. AcAB implemented the Hope College writing policy adopted last year.
6. AcAB asked the Dean's Council to conduct a study of the changing nature of faculty expectation and duties with the goal of better understanding and articulating faculty duties and needs to the broader college administration and Board of Trustees.
7. AcAB provided feedback to the Provost on the standard for student recognition on the Dean's List.
8. AcAB accepted various Committee and academic program recommendations.
9. AcAB developed a policy for recording (audio, still photo, and video) in the classroom.

Each of the activities is described in detail below. Ongoing issues and lessons learned are also listed.

**Actions of the 2013-14 Academic Affairs Board**

**1. Faculty Survey**

The Academic Affairs Board invited the Hope College faculty to participate in a survey of six issues impacting the academic program: workload, assessment, scheduling, grading,

diversity, and technology. The goals of the survey were to identify the most important issues impacting the academic program and to assist AcAB and its constituent committees in addressing these issues.

Faculty were asked to rank these issues on an A-E scale, similar to an academic scale except that E meant no opinion. From the 136 responses received, the following chart summarizes the percent of C and D ratings, meaning ***the percent of faculty who felt that discussion and/or change is definitely needed*** on a topic:

Topic	C+D =
Recognition of faculty workload	57%
Student Assessment of Learning and Teaching (SALT)	46%
Global learning and diversity education, including off-campus opportunities	43%
Academic scheduling (e.g., course conflicts)	38%
Online instruction	30%
Feedback to students (e.g., grading practices, grade reporting)	16%

Faculty also provided 35 pages of comments on the above topics, which were anonymized and compiled into a report. The full report of the topic ratings and free responses is available to the Hope College Community via the Provost's website:

<http://www.hope.edu/admin/provost/internal/2013AcABFacultySurveyDetails.pdf>

AcAB shared the survey results with the following constituencies:

- Faculty workload: AcAB provided the free response details to PIC for categorizing faculty concerns and preparing for a faculty forum on this topic. AcAB also passed a motion asking the Dean's Council to study and report on the changing nature of faculty expectation and duties.
- SALT: AcAB provided the free response details to the Assessment Committee for their consideration in revising SALT and teaching evaluations.
- Global learning and diversity: AcAB provided the free response details to the International Education Committee for their consideration in recommending activities and policies to promote diversity on campus.
- Online instruction: AcAB provided the free response details to the Academic Computing Committee for their consideration in promoting effective use of technology on campus.

The remaining two topics, student feedback and academic scheduling, had been considered by previous AcAB's. Student feedback was considered by the 2010-11 AcAB, which passed a policy for the Registrar's Office to report both absolute grades (A, B, C, ...) and relative student rank (90%, 80%, 70%, ...) in all courses; however, this policy was subject to considerable faculty debate and rescinded the following year. Academic scheduling was considered by the 2011-12 AcAB, when alternative academic schedules were developed, issues associated with a more uniform scheduling policy were considered, but no new

policy was proposed or adopted. These two issues still remain of concern to faculty, but were ranked as lower priorities this year, possibly because they were recently considered or because they are very intractable and no straightforward solutions were identified.

## **2. Zero-Credit Courses**

A large fraction of AcAB's time this year was devoted to understanding the issues associated with "zero-credit courses", interacting with Departments that would be impacted by a policy on such courses, and developing a policy to deal with zero-credit courses in a consistent manner.

"Zero-credit courses" are standard courses (i.e., they are listed in the college catalog, registration is required, outcomes appear on student transcripts, their instruction is factored into faculty workload) for which students receive zero credit (i.e., the course does not impact GPA, the course does not count toward 126 credit graduation requirement, the course does not count toward the total credit count for which students are charged).

It might seem counter-intuitive that zero-credit courses should exist. However, students desire these courses so that they can benefit from the learning experience without having to pay additional fees for additional credits. Faculty desire these courses so that they can document their instructional efforts. Zero-credit courses also serve as a means for documenting teaching and learning experiences.

Zero-credit courses have arisen at Hope College over the last decade in an ad hoc manner. Current zero-courses include Engineering and Physics Seminar (ENGS 080 and PHYS 080); Concert Attendance (MUS 080); Chapel Choir, College Chorus, Orchestra; Wind Ensemble, Concert Band, etc. (MUS 115, 116, 117, 120, 130, 133, 135, 140, 160); and Conditioning and Weight Training and Women's Body Training (KIN 112 and 114). These zero-credit courses were approved for very different reasons: documenting program accreditation, encouraging attendance, encouraging participation, and accommodating NCAA regulations.

In the previous (2012-13) academic year, several additional programs sought to offer zero-credit courses, including Natural and Applied Science Departments (for undergraduate research) and Dance and Theater Departments (for performances). Concerns were raised by the Curriculum Committee about the lack of a College policy for guidance in approving such courses. The 2012-13 AcAB requested that the Curriculum Committee draft such a policy. The Curriculum Committee returned a draft that detailed the implementation of such a policy, but left open the question of what criteria should be used in determining whether a course could be approved for zero-credits.

The 2013-14 AcAB addressed this issue by identifying the underlying issues, interacting with impacted Departments, and articulating a policy. Some of the key perspectives that were raised include:

- Hope College courses and activities are resources that students value and that incur expenses; students should be charged for being involved in these activities so as to not lose this potential revenue stream.

- It is in Hope College’s interest to promote student participation in various activities (e.g., athletics, performances, research); charging for such activities would diminish student participation and be harmful to Hope College.
- There would be little lost income associated with the implementation of zero-credit courses, as students are already participating in the activities at no expense; there could be some additional cost associated with such courses, if faculty effort associated with their implementation is formally recognized.
- Faculty effort in non-credit bearing educational activities with students is not formally recognized within the formal workload accounting system, though it contributes significantly to time and effort spent by faculty instructing and working with students.
- Zero-credit courses appearing on a transcript recognize student learning and accomplishments in a formal manner.
- Zero-credit courses appear on college transcripts and must meet academic integrity standards.
- Caution should be exhibited to prevent “zero-credit course” proliferation.
- Zero-credit courses should recognize and emphasize Hope College distinctives that are otherwise unrecognized, focusing in particular on experiential learning (research, ensembles, performances).

The resulting policy (see Appendix 1) recognizes that credit-bearing courses are the Hope College norm and that proposals for zero-credit courses must offer compelling reasons why the course must be offered for zero-credits rather than for credit. Zero-credit courses may be offered for experiential learning activities with well-defined disciplinarily-defined standards for academic rigor and with specific learning outcomes. Zero-credit courses require direct interaction of Hope faculty and students.

In the opinion of the 2013-14 AcAB Chair and many Board members, the need for a zero-credit course policy was the result of three underlying factors:

- Because the number of credit hours after which students are charged for additional fees was reduced to 16 credits and there has been a change from a 3-credit to a 4-credit course norm, students no longer have room in their schedule to register for credit-bearing experiential learning courses without incurring additional fees.
- Faculty want to be recognized for their effort in teaching students in educational activities outside of formal courses.
- Students want to participate in these learning experiences and have their accomplishments recognized on their transcripts.

Zero-credit courses address the short-term manifestations of these underlying issues. However, the College might consider a more long-term and strategic approach in the future to addressing the underlying causes by disentangled changing the cost structure of student credits (16 is low compared to other colleges), reconsidering the 4-credit hour norm for courses, recognizing the broad nature of faculty workload, and/or developing a co-curricular student transcript.

### **3. Clarification of Credit Hour Definition**

During the onsite visit by the Higher Learning Commission visitation team, a question was raised about the definition of a credit hour, particularly for online courses. As a result, AcAB received and passed a motion that “The Academic Affairs Board affirms that the credit hour definition on page 115 of the Catalog applies to all delivery modalities, and the catalog will be revised accordingly.” Page 115 of the College Catalog reads: “CREDITS – Courses are usually 1, 2, 3, or 4 credits a semester. Each credit of class work generally requires a minimum of two hours of preparation out of class, two or three hours of laboratory work, requiring no outside preparation, are generally equivalent to one class credit.”

The intent of this motion was to suggest that all modalities, e.g., in-person, online, or hybrid courses, follow the same definition of credit. However, the definition of a credit hour in terms of student work both in and out of class will likely need additional clarification by AcAB in the future. This might impact the academic schedule and faculty workload issues. (And of course, the punctuation error in the College Catalog should also be corrected.)

#### **4. Meeting with Student Congress**

In addition to soliciting faculty input on issues important to the academic program (see item 1 above), AcAB also sought student input by having the AcAB Chair meet with, speak before, and receive comments from Student Congress. The goals of this interaction were to emphasize the importance of student participation in the shared governance system and to inform AcAB of student concerns.

The main concerns reported by Student Congress to AcAB were:

- 73 first-year students could not be scheduled for spring 2014 during registration week because all their requested courses were already full.
- The academic scheduling process is frustrating for all students: too many courses are filled, and too many students are placed on waitlists.
- In the words of Student Congress, “There is a shortage of professors.” There are not enough sections, small courses are being cancelled, and sophomores and juniors are not able to get into desired courses.
- The College should be more open to substitutions for General Education requirements.

#### **5. Follow-up on Writing Instruction Policy**

The 2012-13 AcAB passed the Hope College Writing Instruction Policy that required writing instruction to take place both in the General Education curriculum and in each major. Departments were given significant latitude in the implementation of the writing requirement for their majors, as long as the end result meets the writing instruction requirements in the policy. Departments were to report on their implementation of the writing instruction policy for majors by January 25, 2014.

It was recognized that Departments had little time to implement a requirement that could significantly impact their curriculum and had little guidance in the preparation of a report. Thus, the 2013-14 AcAB revised the report requirement into a two-stage process. Departments would first submit an “Inventory” of the writing done in their courses (categorized by which requirements of the writing policy were met) by January 25, 2014. Then Departments would submit a “Report” on their curriculum and any proposed changes that would fulfill the writing policy by April 15, 2014. Templates for these two submissions were developed and distributed to Department Chairs. Submissions are to be turned into Divisional Deans, who in turn will forward them to the Director of College Writing for analysis and evaluation.

## **6. Faculty Duties and Expectations**

It has become very clear that faculty and staff workload has become the top concern among Hope College faculty in being able to deliver an outstanding education experience to our students. The increase in time and effort required by faculty to perform their jobs was the central concern in the spring 2013 PIC survey, the fall 2013 AcAB faculty survey (see item 1 above), and the spring 2014 PIC faculty forum.

The general consensus of these surveys is not that the number of contact hours or credit hours has significantly changed over the past decade, but rather that there have been significant changes in the expectations and duties of faculty. Faculty are reporting increased time required for communicating with students due to the expectation for rapid response by email and/or text, increased tutoring and counseling needs for students due to more educationally diverse backgrounds of students, increased bureaucracy and forms due to internal and external reporting requests, increased time for incorporating new technology into courses at ever-faster rates, increased expectations of service and requests to participate on ad hoc committees, reduced boundaries between work and home, and more. The end result seems to be that Hope faculty are taking on many more roles than before, which is requiring additional time and increasing faculty workloads.

Addressing this issue will require cooperation and understanding among the faculty, administration, and Board of Trustees. To promote conversation on this topic, AcAB passed a motion (see Appendix 2) that the Dean’s Council use the recent survey and forum results to undertake a study characterizing the changing nature of faculty expectations and duties. The intent is that the Dean's Council better understand and articulate faculty duties and needs to the broader College administration and Board of Trustees. The results of this study are to be reported back to AcAB by October 15, 2014.

The long-term goal of this motion is for the faculty, administration, and Board of Trustees to work together in developing strategies for delivering an outstanding and personalized educational experience to Hope students in a healthy working environment.

## **7. Feedback on Standard for Dean’s List**

The Academic Affairs Board received a request from the Provost to provide feedback on the standard for the Dean's List. Currently, the standard for being placed on the Dean's List is earning a semester GPA of 3.5, with the result that 43% of the Hope students earn Dean's List honors each semester. This percentage seemed rather high, as almost half of the student body is being recognized with this distinction. By comparison, 31% of students would qualify if the standard were a GPA of 3.7, and 28% would qualify if the standard were 3.75. Coincidentally, 3.5 is the GPA standard for graduation with Cum Laude Honors, and 3.7 is the GPA standard for graduation with Magna Cum Laude Honors

AcAB requested the following data, which was provided by the Registrar:

- The GPA standard for the Dean's List has not been changed since before 1990, whereas the GPA standard for Graduation Honors (Cum Laude, Magna Cum Laude, Summa Cum Laude) was increased by 0.1-0.2 points in 2005.
- In 1990, ~22% of students earned Dean's List honors. This rose steadily to ~43% in 2000, where it has since remained.
- In an informal poll by the Registrar of other schools:
  - 2 have Dean's List standards below 3.5,
  - 13 have Dean's List standards equal to 3.5,
  - 12 have Dean's List standards greater than 3.5, and
  - 5 of these 12 schools have tiered levels of distinction, e.g., Dean's List and President's List.

A survey of GLCA school websites by an AcAB member revealed that:

- Only 2 schools in the GLCA have Dean's List standards greater than 3.5.

The following observations were made by student and faculty AcAB members:

- The Dean's List is a semester-by-semester honor, whereas Graduation Honors are for an entire academic career, so the standards could be different.
- Hope's standard should be consistent with other schools, especially those in the GLCA/ACM, so as not to disadvantage Hope students relative to students at other schools.
- There was support for a tiered system of distinction.

No action was taken by AcAB beyond offering feedback, as it was recognized that the responsibility for setting the standard for the Dean's List lies with the Provost. The Provost thanked the Registrar and AcAB for their input.

## **8. Accepting Various Recommendations of Committees and/or Academic Programs**

AcAB's responsibilities includes reviewing and approving various changes in the academic program, particularly those that are not handled by a constituent Committee. These included:

A. Oman program. AcAB granted official off-campus study program status for the Oman Semester at the Al Amana Center in Muscat, Oman, which is run by a Reformed Church

missionary under the wing of Northwestern College. Hope faculty have visited the program, and a program review was conducted by the Director of Hope's Fried International Center.

B. Women's and Gender Studies Program. AcAB supported the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee to change the name of the Women's Studies Program to the Women's and Gender Studies Program. This change reflects the transformation of the discipline and more accurately describes the current nature of program.

C. Revision of First-Year Seminar objectives. AcAB approved a minor revision of the First-Year Seminar (FYS) objectives, which changed the 8 original objectives into 5 core objectives (which all FYS courses will emphasize) and 3 recommended objectives (which are encouraged but not required). The changes were developed by the Director of FYS and the Director of General Education at the request of the Provost and "first-year experience" ad hoc group. The revision emphasizes the defining characteristics of a seminar and encourages new directions for future course development.

## **9. Recording Policy**

Recording (audio, still photo, and video) is both a societal and college issue. Students sometimes want to record classroom activities for learning purposes, but classroom recording can stifle trust and conversation needed in a discussion-oriented class. AcAB developed and approved a classroom recording policy that strives to recognize current norms and practice, promote student learning, differentiate between public and private space, create a safe classroom environment, respect individual privacy, provide for informed consent, consider potential consequences from distribution of such materials, and be consistent with the institutional values of Hope College.

In brief, (i) students must ask for and obtain permission to record from the instructor, (ii) students may not distribute such recordings, and (iii) instructors will inform the class if recording has been permitted. The full policy is given in Appendix 3.

## **Topics for the 2014-15 Academic Affairs Board**

### **1. Teaching Evaluation and College Assessment**

In response to the detailed faculty feedback from the 2013 AcAB faculty survey, the Assessment Committee has requested clarification about separating instructor evaluation from college-wide assessment activities.

The HCAT (Hope College Assessment of Teaching) form was replaced with SALT (Student Assessment of Teaching and Learning) in the late 1990's / early 2000's. By its nature, SALT assesses college-wide learning goals at a broad level and instructor effectiveness in a general manner. Some have suggested that "SALT is problematic in its efforts to do both of these things and perhaps does not do either adequately."



AcAB will need to work with the Assessment Committee, and potentially other groups on campus, to insure that both instructor teaching evaluations and college-wide student learning goals are assessed in a practical and meaningful fashion. Additional resources may need to be devoted to accomplish both of these.

## **2. Credit Hour Definition**

Hope College was again fully accredited by the Higher Learning Commission in 2014. However, a follow-up item from the accreditation visit was a request to more precisely define a credit hour at Hope College.

The question about the correspondence between contact hour and credit hour was previously raised in AcAB when discussing student workload as reported by SALT (comparing student workload for 3 vs. 4 contact hour courses) and when discussing the academic schedule (3 vs. 4 contact hour norm). The move to a “4-credit hour norm” in the 1990’s was implemented in part as a low-cost approach to addressing faculty workloads. Though one expects some variation in student effort among courses, the expectation that 4-credit courses require more effort than 3-credit courses is not supported by available evidence. The retention of a “3-contact hour norm” for academic scheduling is due in part to limited classroom space. However, for the nearly 40% of courses that meet 4 contact hours per week, the 4th hour is scheduled in an ad hoc manner that conflicts with a second 3-hour time block, thereby increasing scheduling conflicts for students.

Some have argued that the end result is a seemingly arbitrary association of 3 vs. 4 credit hours with 3 vs. 4 contact hours. Regardless, this is a very complicated issue involving student workload, faculty workload, and available classroom space. Significant attention will be required in all of these areas by the 2014-15 AcAB.

## **3. Follow-Up on Ongoing Matters**

The 2014-15 Board will likely want to follow-up on the following matters initiated by earlier Boards:

- A) A report to be provided regularly by the Provost’s Office on any proposals to establish or significantly revise programs with an academic component, i.e., any academic programs that would otherwise not be examined and approved by the Curriculum Committee (see 4/29/13 AcAB minutes).
- B) A report to be provided by the Director of College Writing on the implementation of the Hope College Writing Instruction Policy (see 4/29/13 and 12/3/13 AcAB Minutes).
- C) A report to be provided by the Dean’s Council by October 15 on the changing nature of faculty duties and its impact on faculty workload (see 3/4/14 AcAB minutes)

## **Lessons Learned**

The 2013-14 AcAB Chair is very appreciative to the hard work, thoughtful perspectives, and respectful discussion by this year's AcAB members. The concern and dedication of the student, faculty, and administrator members to excellence in education at Hope College is truly inspiring!

A few broader experiences were learned in confronting and handling issues brought before AcAB this year.

### **1. Unanticipated Consequences**

The most complex and time-consuming issues arose when seemingly unrelated but conflicting issues were brought together. This past year it was the zero-credit course issue, which brought together student experiential learning, college finances, and faculty workload. Next year it will likely be the definition of credit hour, which will bring together student workload, faculty workload, and classroom space. In both of these cases, cost-saving compromises were initially made (e.g., increasing credits associated with courses, decreasing student credits allowed before charging additional fees, admitting more students without building more classroom space) which then later created deeper long-term challenges (e.g., student registration for experiential learning courses, faculty workload recognition, course scheduling).

### **2. Working Subcommittees**

AcAB functioned most effectively when it combined subcommittee and full Board work. Subcommittees were particularly effective in defining issues and drafting language. The Board was effective in building broad consensus and seeing the big picture. Future AcAB Chairs are advised to use both mechanisms to the Board's advantage.

### **3. Involving College Staff and Program Directors**

Involving College staff and program directors in Board discussions is a useful way to stay grounded in reality when making policy decisions. This year AcAB benefitted significantly from participation by Carol DeJong (Registrar), Courtney Werner (Director of College Writing), and Ryan White (Director of FYS Program and Advising). Excellent advice was offered regarding implementation of zero-credit courses, writing instruction reports, and FYS objective revisions.

## **Appendix 1: Zero-Credit Course Policy (adopted 3/4/14)**

Offering courses for credit is the Hope College norm. Proposals for a zero credit course must provide compelling reasons why a course must be offered for zero credit or provide a reason why the course activity cannot be part of an existing course. Zero credit courses may be offered for experiential learning opportunities. These opportunities must exhibit academic rigor as defined by the discipline. Hope College faculty will interact directly with students, and the course will lead to specific learning outcomes. Exceptions will be made for attendance-based zero credit courses only when such courses are required for program accreditation and the requirement cannot be fulfilled in other credit-bearing ways. The Academic Affairs Board will evaluate the effectiveness of offering zero-credit courses in three years.

The implementation of zero-credit courses is subject to:

1. Departments may offer zero-credit courses. These courses must be submitted to the Curriculum Committee for regular approval as Hope College courses.
2. Students registering for zero-credit courses must be full time degree-seeking students or receive permission from the Registrar.
3. Zero-credit courses may be required for a major or minor only if the course is required for program accreditation.
4. All academic policies applicable to credit-bearing courses will apply to zero-credit courses.
5. Because zero-credit courses will appear on the Hope College academic transcript, academic standards must be applied to guarantee academic integrity.
6. Departments wishing to offer zero-credit courses will establish the academic standards applied in the zero-credit courses. The standard must be clearly stated in the course proposal and must be proportional to the department's for-credit offerings.
7. The course proposal should specify how many hours the student will be expected to work, and what the work will include, to achieve a passing grade in the zero-credit course.
8. Only courses which have been specifically proposed to and approved by the Curriculum Committee as zero-credit courses will be offered for zero credits.
9. If a department wishes to offer a specific course for variable credits (zero-credit or one-credit), the Curriculum Committee course proposal for that course must include both options, and the catalog copy for the course must include both options.
10. In general, for a zero-credit course, a student must complete at least thirty hours of work (including both in-class and out-of-class work) during a fifteen-week semester.

Departments wishing to apply a different standard must clearly state their requirements and their justifications for those requirements in the course proposal.

11. To keep zero-credit courses from overwhelming students, a zero-credit course may not require a student to work more than forty-five hours (including both in-class and out-of-class work) during a fifteen-week semester. Departments wishing to apply a different standard must clearly state their requirements and their justifications for those requirements in the course proposal.
12. The workload in a zero-credit course need not be evenly distributed over the course of the semester, but the course syllabus should make clear the distribution of the work expected of the student.
13. Zero-credit courses will be graded pass-fail. If a zero-credit course is required for a major or minor, it is an exception to the rule that courses in a major or minor may not be taken pass-fail.
14. Zero-credit courses cannot be changed to credit-bearing courses at any time after the add-drop period for the semester during which the student takes the course.

#### Catalog Text:

Some courses may be offered for zero credits. Zero-credit courses are specifically listed as zero-credit courses. Courses not listed as zero-credit courses will not be offered for zero credits. Courses taken for zero credits will not be retroactively changed to credit-bearing courses at any time. All academic policies applicable to credit-bearing courses are also applicable to zero-credit courses. All zero-credit courses will be graded pass-fail. If a zero-credit course is required for a major or minor, it is an exception to the rule that courses in a major or minor may not be taken pass-fail.

#### **Appendix 2: Faculty Duties and Expectations (adopted 3/4/14)**

Whereas AcAB is charged with proposing “studies aimed at making the academic program constantly more effective”, faculty workload and duties are integral to the effective delivery of an academic program, and recent surveys indicate that faculty have experienced significant changes in their expectations and duties, AcAB moves that the Dean’s Council use the spring 2013 PIC Survey, fall 2013 AcAB Survey, and spring 2014 PIC Faculty Forum Summary to undertake a study that characterizes the changing nature of faculty expectations and duties with the goal that the Dean's Council be better able to understand and articulate faculty duties and needs to the broader College administration and Board of Trustees. The results of this study are to be reported back to AcAB by October 15, 2014.

#### **Appendix 3: Classroom Recording Policy (adopted 4/29/14)**

The audio, still photo, and video recording of classroom lecture, discussion, laboratory, studio, and other activities by analog, digital, or future recording technology is governed by this classroom recording policy.

In brief, ***students must ask for and obtain permission to record from the instructor and may not distribute such recordings. Instructors will inform the class if recording has been permitted.***

This classroom recording policy strives to recognize current norms and practice, promote student learning, differentiate between public and private space, create a safe classroom environment, respect individual privacy, provide for informed consent, consider potential consequences from distribution of such materials, and be consistent with the institutional values of Hope College. Details of the policy follow.

Student wishing to record classroom activities must request permission from the instructor before doing so. The instructor will have sole discretion to determine if recording will be allowed (see ADA exception below). Instructor permission may be granted by means of a permission form, email, orally (not recommended), or by statement in the course syllabus. Permission may be denied similarly.

If permission has been granted to any student to record classroom activities, the instructor must inform all students and other course participants that recording may occur.

Student classroom recordings are to be used solely for the personal academic study and review of the student. With the explicit permission of the instructor, classroom recordings may also be used with other students enrolled in the same course. Any further sharing or distribution of student classroom recordings is expressly prohibited. Alleged violations will be subject to College disciplinary proceedings as described below.

Faculty wishing to record classroom activities must inform all students and other participants of the nature and purpose of the recording. Any further distribution of such recordings is prohibited without obtaining written consent of all individuals identifiable on the recording.

Students may record classroom activity as an accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act. In such cases, the student must obtain approval from the Academic Support Center and inform the course instructor. The instructor will then allow such recording and inform other students that recording may take place, though not identify the individual making the request.

Violations of this policy will be subject to appropriate grade and non-grade sanctions. The instructor should meet with the student to determine the facts of the case. The instructor may choose to impose no sanction or lower a student's grade on an assignment. Under special circumstances such as documented harm to a classmate or to the instructor, a failing grade for the course may be assigned. The instructor may also recommend non-grade sanctions to the Provost. In any case, all violations of the policy shall be documented by the instructor and communicated to the Provost (with a copy to the student). The Provost will keep such records until the student graduates. The student has the right to

appeal the instructor's recommended sanction to the Provost. The Provost will uphold, modify, or reject the recommendation of the professor, and will communicate the decision to the student. The student may appeal the Provost's decision to the Student Standing and Appeals Committee.

**Sample Recording Agreement**

Student: \_\_\_\_\_ ID #: \_\_\_\_\_  
Course: \_\_\_\_\_ Term: \_\_\_\_\_  
Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_

Permission has been requested and granted to record the above activities in the above course for individual learning purposes.

If asked at any point to turn off my recording during class, I will do so.

I will use the recordings only for my individual learning. I will not share the recordings [with anyone outside the course] or distribute them in any manner or format.

I understand that violation of this agreement will subject me to College disciplinary proceedings and may result in legal sanctions for violation of copyright law.

Student Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Instructor Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Proposed Catalog Copy (end of section A within Code for Academic Integrity, p. 86).**

**The classroom recording policy** applies to audio, still photo, and video recording of classroom lecture, discussion, laboratory, studio, and other activities by analog, digital, or future recording technology. This policy strives to recognize current norms and practice, promote student learning, differentiate between public and private space, create a safe classroom environment, respect individual privacy, provide for informed consent, consider potential consequences from distribution of such materials, and be consistent with the institutional values of Hope College. In brief, (i) students must ask for and obtain permission to record from the instructor, (ii) students may not distribute such recordings, and (iii) instructors will inform the class if recording has been permitted. Violations of this policy will be subject to appropriate grade and/or non-grade sanctions. The full policy is contained in the STUDENT HANDBOOK.