

<b>Academic Policies Committee</b>	
Minutes	
Thursday, November 2, 2017	
Ellison Campus Center	
Meeting: APC 2017/2018:03	
Convened	3:19 p.m.
Attending	Joseph Cambone, Andrew Darien, Michele C. Dávila, Clarke Fowler, Bonnie Galinski, Ethel Gordon, Joseph Gustafson, Severin Kitanov, Martin Krugman (vice-chair), Sara Mana, Sara Moore, Kathy Neville, Arthur Rosenthal, Jeramie Silveira, Cindy Vincent, Peter Walker (Chair), and Carol Zoppel
Guest(s)	Neil DeChillo, Rebecca Hains (Communications), Meghan McLyman (Music and Dance)
Documents (attached)	Proposal 18:122 Dance Audition + attachment: Request for Dance Audition; Proposal 18:158 General Education Course Recertification + attachment: General Education Course Recertification Procedures;
I.	<p><b>Chair's Report</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> To rearrange the agenda items for discussion to accommodate the guests who arrived first (Neil DeChillo and Rebecca Hains). Motion made by: B. Galinski; Seconded by: C. Zoppel</p> <p><b>Vote:</b> In favor (13). Against (0). Abstention (1).</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> To approve APC October 19 minutes as revised. Motion made by: S. Kitanov Seconded by: C. Zoppel</p> <p><b>Vote:</b> Motion passed unanimously.</p>
II.	<p><b>Fall Meeting Dates:</b> November 30 and December 14</p>
III.	<p><b>Old Business</b></p> <p>A. P. Walker reminds the committee about postponing the CJ proposal (Old Business). Still waiting to see what will come out of this proposal.</p> <p>B. Review of existing academic policies (Old Business). S. Mana asks about how to navigate the site and whether we would be able to determine what documents we're expected to read. J. Cambone explains how to navigate the document site. C. Vincent is willing to serve as IT contact for the site accessibility. P. Walker: reiterates that we agreed to read the documents for the Nov. 30 meeting. P. Walker asks how people ought to report within and outside groups. J. Cambone: group members should communicate through e-mail and choose one person to report for the group. A. Darien asks for clarification of division of labor regarding report review. P. Walker suggests that committee members review the Oct. 19 minutes to identify their own group. S. Mana has gone through all the links of the Academic Policies documents—most are broken. We'll probably need to bring in a technology person to fix the link.</p>
IV.	<b>New Business</b>

**A. Review of Proposal 18:158, General Education Course Recertification, submitted by Kanishkan Sathasivam, Faculty Fellow for Gen Ed (Political Science)**

**Motion:** To approve proposal 18:158, General Education Course Recertification

Motion made by: M. Krugman

Seconded by: J. Silveira

**Overview:** N. DeChillo speaks for the proposal, explaining the history of the recertification decision. Since the Curriculum Committee (CC) has yet to review the policy, APC may have to wait for CC to weigh in on the policy.

R. Hains explains that CC discussed the proposal with Tad Baker and requested extensive changes (proposal had originally no tracking number). Concerns involved, among other things, how much assessment should be part of this recertification policy implementation. No policy was available at the time the decision to recertify courses was made. P. Walker: If CC decides to adopt the procedures, our role is to approve. The only question is whether CC will approve the procedures. A. Darien questions how much work this will create for CC. Same concern shared by R. Hains. Probably the bulk of the committee work will have to happen in the Spring semester. N. DeChillo: The procedure should not create a lot of work for departments. P. Walker: What is one looking for in recertification process? N. DeChillo: The key thing is the table found in the Recertification Procedures document. Departments have to consider whether or not they want to continue with the Gen Ed certification. It's up to the department to determine *whether* they want to continue assessing Gen Ed courses, and if so, how. P. Walker: Would it make sense to simply say we're willing to approve whatever procedures CC approves? R. Hains: Cannot foresee the nature of the conversation, but CC members are very committed to overseeing the Gen Ed progress and success. A short discussion ensued about the deficiencies of the Quantitative, Writing, and Diversity (QVW designations) requirements in the old core curriculum and about avoiding a repeat of those deficiencies. P. Walker: Either table or postpone the proposal until CC comes back to us with the finalized procedures document. M. Krugman: Prefer to table since we don't know exactly what we want to do with the procedures.

**Motion:** To table policy 18:158, General Education Course Recertification

Motion made by: M. Krugman

Seconded by: C. Vincent

**Vote:** Motion to table passed unanimously.

**B. Review of Proposal 18:122 Dance Audition, submitted by Meghan McLyman (Music and Dance)**

**Motion:** To approve proposal 18:122.

Motion made by S. Kitanov

Seconded by M. Dávila

	<p><b>Overview:</b> M. McLyman explains the rationale for having a dance audition for a program that is in its third year. Program is community-based and open to students, but the audition gives the program a stamp of credibility and will help with advertising. An online submission program will be used as well: \$30 fee goes to students, it's free for the university. B. Galinski: Might this impact enrollment? Meghan: Hopefully, in a positive way. Comparison with Music shows that there's a slight dip at first, but then enrollment goes up again. If student can't do either kind of audition, a possible accommodation can be discussed with the student. Audition is just a standard, professional practice, giving value to the program. C. Fowler: Why do live audition applicants do one dance whereas online audition applicants do two dances? M. McLyman: Live applicants are also observed in the Dance Studio they attend on the day auditions are held. J. Silveira: Is there a way to include creative language to expand audition options? P. Walker: Who is the audience of the policy? SSU students already or not. Adding language for non-current students? How would the Admissions Office know that there's an audition process? B. Galinski: Students will be told during the initial interview process. If proposal approved, B. Galinski will have to alert Admissions Office regarding the change. Proposal text should be changed from coming into effect in Fall 2018 to Fall 2019. M. McLyman agrees to change the proposal language to clarify the policy for current SSU students. Suggested changes: Change "prospective students" to "applicants" and/or "prospective dance majors." It is suggested to tweak the language of the audition policy for the sake of more clarity. The approved language will appear in the Music &amp; Dance Department website. P. Walker: Does Megan Miller know how to operate on the basis of this policy? B. Galinski will make sure.</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> To amend the language of the proposed policy in five places and approve proposal 18:122.          Motion made by A. Rosenthal          Seconded by S. More          S. Kitanov accepts the proposed amendment as a friendly amendment.</p> <p><b>Vote:</b> amended motion passed unanimously.</p>
<p><b>V.</b></p>	<p><b>Adjournment</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Motion to adjourn.          Motion made by: A. Rosenthal          Seconded by: B. Galinski</p> <p><b>Vote:</b> Motion passed unanimously.</p>
<p><b>Adjourned</b></p>	<p>at 4:06 p.m.</p>

Respectfully submitted,  
 Severin Kitanov, Philosophy

Next Meeting: Thursday, November 30