

Academic Policies Committee

Minutes

27 September 2019

Minutes approved:

In Attendance: Agnieszka Chwialkowska, Nancy Penco, Emily McKendry-Smith, Michael Hopper, Jaius-Joaquin Matthews, Donna Haley, Ashley Lewis, Jill Drake, Beheruz Sethna, Jennifer Jordan, Carrie Carmack, Erin Layton, Logan Taulien

The meeting began at 2:00 PM.

- I. Academic Renewal Policy Proposal
 - a. Donna Haley raised two issues regarding the new proposed policy:
 - i. It was clarified that as part of the new policy, some aspect of academic renewal will move from enrollment services to admissions.
 - ii. The issue was raised of students with associate's degrees. It is expected that guidelines will be forthcoming from the BOR on how to proceed for this type of student.
 - b. Discussion of the eligibility requirements for Academic Renewal.
 - i. It would be preferable if students applied the semester that they enter UWG, but the BOR allows for a full year (bullet point #2 under "Requirements for Eligibility.")
 1. This raised a question about how "one calendar year" will be measured.
 2. It was decided to amend the text of bullet point #2 to read "one calendar year after enrolling or re-enrolling."
 - c. Discussion of #4 in the "About the Policy" section.
 - i. It was clarified that the BOR's language has changed to include coursework completed during the absence and the policy is changing UWG's language to reflect this.
 - ii. #4 was edited to remove the word "previously" and the comma after the first use of "coursework."
 - d. The proposed policy passes unanimously.
- II. Adult Transfer Policy Revision
 - a. Jennifer Jordan requests that the policy be simple.
 - i. Justin Barlow noted that specific language is not included in the policy, such as specifying ranges, as being very specific may lead to problems.
 - ii. Language from the BOR is now being used in the proposed policy.

- b. Discussion of what constitutes a non-traditional transfer.
 - i. These are students who have been away from high school for at least 5 years and already have 30 or more hours of transfer credit.
 - ii. The policy on non-traditional transfers is already in the catalog and can be linked to in this policy.
- c. Donna Haley raised an issue regarding the use of “regionally accredited” in the first paragraph of the proposed policy.
 - i. It was clarified that the college or university that a student is transferring from can be in any region but must be regionally accredited by the regional accrediting body.
 - ii. The possibility was raised of giving examples to clarify this. A concern was raised that students or applicants may not understand what accreditation is or know if a school is accredited.
 - iii. Beheruz Sethna clarified that national accreditation typically refers to disciplinary accreditation, while regional accreditation refers to groups of states.
 - iv. It was proposed to add “ie” and a list of regional accrediting organizations.
 - v. Michael Hopper noted that for the Latin to be correct, this should be eg rather than ie.
- d. An issue was raised regarding international transfer students.
 - i. These students are covered under a different policy.
- e. The proposed policy passes unanimously.

III. Accuplacer Entrance Requirements

- a. Jennifer Jordan explained that the proposed Accuplacer Entrance Requirements add another point of ability for dual enrollment student admissions. She noted that this has been researched by April Wood Stewart.
 - i. The policy is mirroring Georgia Southern and Valdosta requirements, so staying within UWG’s sector.
- b. The policy needs to clarify that the scores listed are minimums.
- c. It was noted that the policy includes both classic and next generation Accuplacer scores. Accuplacer has changed its scoring to make it more compatible with other standardized testing.
- d. Discussion that the SAT and ACT can be cost-prohibited for non-senior high school students.
 - i. Clarification that this policy does not apply to all dual-enrollment students, just juniors and seniors.
 - 1. Non-junior or senior students have additional standards.
 - ii. Clarification that Accuplacer is free for students.
- e. Donna Haley raised the issue of exceptional 10th graders.

- i. It was noted that a section for this population already exists in the catalog and is not being changed. This section is already comparable to the policies at Georgia Southern and Valdosta.
 - f. A question was raised over whether College Board is written as one word or with a space in between: “The” and a space between the words will be added to the document.
 - g. Jennifer Jordan noted that the bulleted list and the chart will appear in the catalog as entrance requirements.
 - h. This item passes unanimously.
- IV. Employment of Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Lecturers
 - a. Dr. Beheruz Sethna provided background information; the BOR has approved a policy adding the rank of “principal lecturer” and the APC is being asked to endorse board policy.
 - b. Discussion that there is no reason to not to allow this for talented lecturers with no promotion opportunities after they attain the rank of senior lecturer.
 - c. Discussion that this would give lecturers two promotion opportunities, making them somewhat comparable with professors, who have two promotion opportunities.
 - d. Discussion that UWG will be able to specify what the criteria are for promotion to Principal Lecturer.
 - e. Dr. Sethna noted that UWG and/or the BOR could consider an alternative to “Principal Lecturer,” such as “Master Lecturer” or “Teaching Professor.”
 - i. The BOR would need to approve a change in the title.
 - f. It was noted that Angela Insenga asked the APC to open discussion on this and then report back to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. It is unclear which committee has jurisdiction over this – APC or Faculty Development.
 - g. It was noted that the BOR is silent on the issue of whether Principal Lecturers must hold a doctoral degree or not.
 - h. Discussion of lecturer promotion history; prior to the creation of “lecturer,” faculty without a PhD would need to leave the university after 6-7 years.
 - i. The committee unanimously agrees to move forward in support of the BOR’s decision and to present this to the executive committee.
- V. Old Business: Policy on Students Majoring and Minorng in same discipline
 - a. There was an update that this policy has not passed Senate, as there are some programs with concerns that there may need to be an exception to the policy.
 - b. Data is being collected from the chairs.
- VI. Date of October meeting
 - a. The date of this meeting is changed to Friday, October 25th at 2 PM.

VII. Minutes

- a. Mark Hopper noted that he was not present at the August meeting and the minutes should be changed to reflect the name of his substitute – Yun Cheng.
- b. The minutes were unanimously passed with this correction.

VIII. New Business: Maximum number of times one can repeat a course

- a. Nancy Pencoe raised the issue that several years ago, the APC had taken up the issue of a maximum number of withdrawals and also considered if there should be a maximum number of time that a student can repeat a particular course.
- b. Nancy Pencoe provided a document with relevant policies at Kennesaw, Georgia Southern, Georgia State, Columbus State, and Valdosta.
 - i. Kennesaw currently has a policy where students taking a course for a third time must make an appeal and receive academic counseling.
- c. Discussion in which many examples were offered of students needing to repeat a course two, three, or five times.
- d. Donna Haley noted that the policy at Kennesaw appears to be college-based (policy is from College of Science and Mathematics).
 - i. Discussion that colleges would need to manage the remediation for students' forth attempt at a course, if UWG were to implement a similar policy.
- e. The issue was raised of if this is possible to put into Banner, raising the broader issue of how students in this situation would be identified.
 - i. Options were discussed, such as that IT might be able to implement something to identify students or that they would need to be identified in advising.
 - ii. Discussion that the identification of violators might not be perfect but having a policy would give the university something to stand on.

IX. Old Business: Update on Revisions to Post-Tenure Review

- a. Jill Drake updated the committee on revisions to the language in the Post-Tenure Review Policy.
 - i. Language of satisfactory/unsatisfactory has been changed to does not meet/ meets/exceeds expectations.
 - ii. This brings the PTR language in line with what the university does in other areas.
 - iii. The "stellar" language has been changed to exceeds expectations. This aids in resolving the ambiguity around "stellar."
- b. There is still a need for change regarding chairs' post-tenure review and the involvement of deans.
 - i. Jill Drake will update the committee on the language changes for chairs at a future meeting.

c. The PTR language changes passes unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:58 PM.