

Academic Policies Committee	
Minutes	
Thursday, October 18 th , 2018	
Ellison Campus Center	
Meeting: APC 2018/2019:	
Convened	3: p.m.
Attending	Joseph Cambone, Elisa Castillo, Gina Curcio, Meghan DeVeau, Ethel Gordon, Joseph Gustafson, Marty Krugman, Sara Mana, Becky Martini, Sara Moore, Courtney Orelup, Jeramie Silveira, Steve Silvern, Lamont Simmons, Peter Walker (Chair), Minesha Washington
Guest(s)	Lee Brossoit, Nicole Harris, Megan Miller Registrar, Carla Panzella, Francesca Pomerantz, Peter Sampieri
Documents (attached)	
I.	<p>Chair's Report</p> <p>Chair P. Walker introduced himself to the guests attending the meeting. He asked for a volunteer to record the minutes today. J. Silveira volunteered to record the minutes and a sign in sheet was distributed. Chair P. Walker explained the online voting process for approving minutes for the new members of the committee and asked that people respond as soon as they can. The chair's report was followed by introductions. Guests from the working group for student success were at the meeting to discuss Policy recommendations 2018-2019.</p> <p>Chair P. Walker mentioned that All-University consider modifying the forms used for APC submissions to highlight changes so they can be more easily seen (as is currently done for Curriculum Committee forms) and add a line where the changes should go in the University Catalog. M. Miller Registrar stated that in the new system which would be coming online soon it would be easy to highlight and add a line so the committee might want to wait on redoing the forms until the system changes were complete.</p> <p>The Chair then asked J. Cambone from the Working Group for Student success to discuss their work. He stated the group was here to get feedback from the APC on changes in policies related to student success that the working group has identified as being a barrier to student success. He explained the list submitted was created to put together to create a series of proposals to get rid of the structural barriers that are impeding students success. (The Military Leave Policy from last year was cited as an example of a policy change that improved barriers). J. Cambone explained that the selective retention committee was able to identify many issues for students that they see repeated over and over. L. Brossoit added that this group was also bringing forward student concerns that had voiced. The first policy change the group would like feedback from the APC is the Criteria for change in major to clarify what criteria is needed for each major and have this information easily accessible to students, possibly to add this information in the catalog. M. Miller discussed the difficulty undecided students are having trying to change their major. She stated it can be difficult for student advisors to accurately find the criteria to get into the new major. M. Krugman stated that many majors' criteria are guided by accreditation standards and that there can't be one template for all departments. He also</p>

	<p>stated that many of the criteria seem arbitrary and can cause greater hurdles for the weaker students. P. Walker asked the student representatives M. Washington and M. DeVeau if they knew of any difficulties finding criteria for changing majors or getting into a major. Both explained they did not have any difficulties getting into their major but M. DeVeau asked if the criteria were in degree tracker for students. M. Miller stated that information was available in degree tracker but if students were not able to get into certain courses in a semester their options that were available for them were not always available in degree tracker. N. Harris stated she felt all departments should have their criteria in the catalog. P Walker felt everyone wants this information available and maybe it would be possible to speak to all of the Chairs about how to report their criteria in as easy and unburdensome a way as possible. P. Walker asked about adding General Education course category information to flow sheets/General Education flow sheets. M. Miller stated it would be difficult to have General Education requirements and options show up on transcripts but they might be able to be added to the advisor transcripts but the print is getting extremely small on those documents. M. Miller also stated that it is important to advise students that if they don't choose to double dip their support course requirements with their General Education requirements it may take them significantly longer and need more credits to graduate. J. Cambone felt this was important information for students to have. C. Panzella asked if the working group needs to be present when they submit policy changes to the committee. P. Walker explained it is the protocol of APC for at least one person to be present to answer any questions the committee may have about an agenda proposal. He also mentioned he receives the policy changes prior to the meeting and is willing to help to draft or to make necessary changes before the information comes to the committee. J. Cambone stated that the policy changes will need to be thrashed out before bringing them to APC.</p>
II.	<p>Approval of the Minutes of previous meeting The meeting minutes from 9/20/2018 were approved online prior to the meeting</p>
III.	<p>Old Business</p>
IV.	<p>New Business Motion: re-order the business for the day to move 19:020, Academic Calendar Rules and Guideline, to the end of new business. Made by: M. Krugman Second: L. Simmons Vote: motion passed unanimously</p> <p>Academic Calendar Rules and Guidelines for Drafting Calendar 19:020-</p> <p>B. Theatre Participation Academic Policy 19:021</p> <p>Motion: To approve policy 19:021: Theatre Participation Academic Policy Motion made by: S. Moore Seconded by: E. Gordon</p>

Overview: P. Sampieri discussed that previously the required theatre participation hours were confusing to students; in the proposed revised policy one hour equals one point and students need fifty points. The amount of work required of students has not changed. He told the committee that much of the change in this policy is language to make it clearer for the students to understand the requirement. P. Walker asked that the requirements for each semester be explained in the first paragraph clearly so students will know what they need to take each semester. P. Walker then asked if there were any additional questions or comments. The committee asked the following changes/corrections be made for the sake of clarity:

- 1) The beginning of the last sentence of the third paragraph should state: "All theatre majors must begin their initial 100 Theatre Participation Points by specifically serving ..."
- 2) 1st paragraph second line when discussing experiential experiences: the "is" should be changed to "are."
- 3) 2nd paragraph clarification is needed on the section that discussed "poorly done jobs will get less points." P. Sampieri agreed to the deletion of the phrase: "a poorly done job will merit less."

Vote: motion to approve the proposal as corrected passed unanimously

BA/M.Ed. and BS/M.Ed. Progression and Intervention Policy

19:132

Motion: to approve the BA/M.Ed. and BS/M. ED. Progression and Intervention Policy:

Motion made by E. Castillo

Seconded by B. Martini

Overview: presented by F. Pomerantz School of Education. She stated this policy was needed because their current policy allowed students who failed a pre-practicum experience to progress in the program without any assessment or intervention by the program. F. Pomerantz explained that in the 4+1 program students' pre-practicum experiences lead up to their senior practicum and are supposed to develop the necessary professional behaviors required. This policy clearly articulates the guidelines to move forward from one part of the program to the next. The policy states that if a student is not performing at the appropriate level on a pre-practicum and assessment occurs and the student may be asked to take an intervention semester to work on skills and behaviors prior to moving forward in the program. J. Cambone stated that all students in the program have a holistic written report completed on them so they can work on the skills and behaviors needed to succeed. M. Miller asked if this applies to the Secondary programs as well. F. Pomerantz responded yes. M. Washington asked if students have to leave the program if they don't pass a pre-practicum; F. Pomerantz explained that students will go on an intervention semester to improve their skills and behaviors and if they don't improve they can be put on another interventions semester, be dismissed or be asked to change their program. J. Cambone reminded the committee that all education students are dual majors. He explained that faculty are involved in the benchmarking assessment and assessment of

professional disposition; faculty go out into the field to assess student performance and give feedback, and the faculty have weekly student engagement meetings to discuss student progress. N. Harris and F. Pomerantz explained the new policy will not be adding a huge new amount of work, faculty are already doing this work. The policy will give them the teeth to make students who need to work on their skills and behaviors do so before they progress in the program. C. Orelup pointed out that the word “must” needs to be deleted from the first sentence of paragraph 1 (last paragraph on the first page of the proposal). P. Walker asked the School of Education to clarify where the proposal will appear in the catalog. School of Education representatives promised to do so. M. Miller asked if the policy could include a statement that clarifies that it applies to all students in all Education programs. J. Cambone stated he will add a second sentence that will list all of the relevant programs. L. Simmons asked about the statement that says multiple grades. M. Krugman stated that there were multiple inconsistencies with indentation of paragraphs. P. Walker asked if they wanted to put some of the rationale given in the proposal in the catalog. J. Cambone stated he did not feel the policy needed to include the rationale. P. Walker asked if the committee trusts the stated changes will be made and to vote on the motion contingent upon the inclusion of changes and corrections or whether the committee would want a revised policy proposal resubmitted. Consensus was to vote to approve contingent upon inclusion of the changes.

The School of Education, subsequent to the meeting, supplied the catalog location for the proposed policy: immediately after the “LifeSpan of Licensure Courses” subsection and immediately before “Policy for Students Who Do Not Complete the Fifth Year of the 4+1 Program in Education” subsection

Vote: motion to approve the proposal contingent upon corrections and indication of catalog location passed unanimously with one abstention.

Safe Medication Administration Test Policy

19:133

Motion: to approve the School of Nursing Safe Medication Administration Test Policy

Motion made by: S. Moore

Second: S. Mana

Overview: C. Orelup explained the policy. She stated that basic math skills are required to be able to competently give medications and that the policy contains four main changes. First the name change of the policy to safe medication administration instead of Math testing policy helps clarify the need for this policy and allows the Nursing program to put additional types of questions on the exam that are related to safe medication administration and are not math related. Second this policy increases the benchmark grade to 90% on the test for NSG 212 and 320 but then ups it to 100% in the second semester of their junior year and senior year. BSN to RN enter at the 200 level which will stay at 90% all others will move to 100%. Third only the first take of the exam will be part of the grade even though students can re-take the exam to reach the 90 or 100%

	<p>benchmark. M. DeVeau asked if students can repeat NSG 212 if they fail it. C. Orelup explained they are allowed to repeat one course only in the program. L. Simmons asked about the effective date of Spring 2019 and if this was possible. M. Miller stated given the nature of the Bourne report it can be done.</p> <p>Vote: motion to approve passed unanimously with one abstention.</p> <p>C. Orelup explained that she is noticing some issues with the second nursing proposal on the agenda and would like to wait on presenting this. The next four motion will become Old Business for the next meeting November 1st:</p> <p>Undergraduate Academic Progression Policy 19:134</p> <p>Request for Declaration/Change of Minor 19:144</p> <p>Selection of Change of Concentration and Selection Options 19:145</p> <p>Majors and Change of Majors 19:146</p>
V.	<p>Adjournment</p> <p>Motion to adjourn. Motion made by: E. Gordon Seconded by: M. DeVeau Motion passed unanimously.</p>
Adjourned	At 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeramie Silveira

Next Meeting: November 1st 2018