

Academic Policies Committee	
Minutes	
Thursday, February 7, 2019	
MLK Room, Ellison Campus Center	
Meeting: APC 2018/2019:7	
Convened	3:15 p.m.
Attending	Elisa Castillo, Annette Chapman-Adisho, Gina Curcio, Cathy Fahey (vice-chair), Bonnie Galinski, Ethel Gordon, Joseph Gustafson, Sara Mana, Becky Martini, Sara Moore, Courtney Orelup, Kristin Pangallo, Cody Sears, Lamont Simmons, Peter Walker (Chair), Minesha Washington
Guest(s)	Ryan Fisher (Biology), Megan Miller (Registrar)
Documents (attached)	Summary of Academic Calendars; revised and approved NMT Program policies (19:235, 19:234); amended and approved Nursing internal transfer policy (19:244)
I.	<p>Chair's Report</p> <p>New student member, Cody Sears, was introduced to the committee.</p> <p>A trustee's meeting on applying a Business Model/Business Intelligence was announced and circulated.</p> <p>Peter Walker described a conversation he had a few days before with the Nursing Department on when a change requires moving through governance. It was decided that academic freedom allows instructors how to teach a course, and that decisions regarding how a course was taught do not need to move through governance. Peter wanted to ensure transparency of these discussions and that the committee concurred with his advice; no objections were raised.</p> <p>The committee was updated as to the progress of the Global Engagement Seal, which the committee discussed during the meeting on January 24, 2019.</p>
II.	<p>Approval of the Minutes of January 24, 2019</p> <p>Meeting minutes were approved online prior to the meeting.</p> <p>A brief discussion occurred about whether online approval of minutes should commence through "Reply" or "Reply All". It was agreed that "Reply All" did not overly burden committee members and provided clarity and transparency.</p>
III.	<p>Old Business</p> <p>A. AY2019-2020 Academic Calendar <u>19:245</u></p> <p>B. AY2020-2021 Academic Calendar <u>18:218</u></p> <p>Chair Peter Walker re-introduced the discussion on the (previously approved) AY2019-2020 and AY202-2021 Academic Calendars, which was postponed from the previous meeting (of Jan. 24). Between the two meetings Kristin Pangallo put together a summary (attached) of the these two calendars, finding that the AY2019-2020 calendar does not</p>

meet the guidelines that were passed at the previous meeting. Specifically, the start date for January 2020 (January 13) does not meet the specified number of days between semesters between January 3 and the start of the semester. A discussion commenced on how best to address this issue, including shifting the start date to January 15 and not altering the end date (removing a few teaching/instructional days). It was pointed out that would result in only 11 Monday class meeting days, which was deemed an inadequate number. Bonnie Galinski volunteered to put together a proposal to address this issue for the next meeting.

C. Biology Nuclear Medicine Technology Program Dismissal Policy

[19:234](#)

D. Biology Nuclear Medicine Technology Program Professional Conduct Policy

[19:235](#)

Chair Peter Walker moved the discussion onto the proposals from the Biology Department and suggested that the committee begin with 19:235, which was postponed from last meeting. The committee agreed and the chair asked Ryan Fisher (guest, Chair of Department of Biology) to discuss the changes made to the proposals.

Ryan Fisher thanked the committee for help editing the proposals and explained that as part of the re-accreditation process for the NMT program it was found that two policies were missing. These two proposals would address this; they are based on hospitals policies from North Shore Medical Center and other hospitals that participate in the program. These two policies would be in the NMT handbook and also on the NMT website.

There was a discussion about the language regarding patients with “inadequacy or impairment.” Ryan Fisher explained that the language was taken from the hospital policies and Elisa Castillo pointed out that if a patient is impaired and unable to ask for medical attention, students (and medical staff) are still required to provide that medical treatment.

The committee requested updating on how students would be trained in this policy and Ryan Fisher reported that the department had discussed the idea of a 1 credit seminar, but that the students already receive training upon entrance to the program.

Peter Walker asked if the department wished to keep the definition of professional conduct in the policy. Ryan Fisher firmly answered yes and explained that students are not clear on this definition and require the additional information.

The motion to approve 19:235 was made in the previous meeting, so the vote was taken.

VOTE: passes unanimously

Motion: Approve the Biology Nuclear Medicine Technology Program Dismissal Policy (19:234)

Made by: Gina Curcio
 Second: Sara Moore

Ryan Fisher commenced the discussion of this policy by explaining that first points of the dismissal policy ensure that academic rigor is maintained, while the following points clearly define expectations during clinical practicums and set forth guidelines for under what conditions students would be dismissed from the program.

Peter Walker pointed out that students can receive up to 3 warnings for violating policies outside of the 10 listed violations, and that violation of the 10 listed policies result in immediate discussal.

Concern was brought up about students having a single bad semester, which might result in their GPA falling to below the threshold for dismissal (2.75). A question was raised about the neccesity of requiring immediate dismissal in this case. Ryan Fisher stated that all NMT students are advised and closely tracked by a single faculty member. He also explained that because the NMT program is very small and that it must maintain an 80% pass rate (over 5 years) on the national qualifying exam, the rigourous academic standards are required. (The example was provided of only 4 students taking the exam – if one fails to pass then the program would fall below the 80% pass rate threshold.) A question was raised as to whether the overall GPA was for all classes or just for math and science classes, and Ryan Fisher specified that it was for math and science. Peter Walker suggested clarifying this in the language of violation #1 from the policy to read: “1. Overall GPA in Math and Science courses falling below the required 2.75. This includes a grade of below 75% for any NMT course.”

The discussion turned to how alcohol and marjuana use are handled in the policy, with Sara Mana pointing out that neither is illegal in Massachusetts but the policy only refers to illegal drugs. Courtney Orelup stated that use of these is still against hospital policies. After brief consideration of how to handle this in the policy, Ryan Fisher pointed out that behavior resulting from substance use would fall under point #8 in the proposal as written (“Any action that jeopardizes the safety of the patient and/or colleague; including, but not limited to, causing unnecessary radiation of the patient.”)

Minesha Washington asked if students starting the NMT program should have to sign this policy. Ryan Fisher answered that students do sign something, and acknowledged that it was a good idea to have them sign this policy, as well. Elisa Castillo pointed out that the defintion of weapon might be different on the different campuses (the word weapon is used in violation #9 of the policy). A few spelling and grammar errors were pointed out (“affilliate” in #3 and “either of” in #10).

Vote: motion passed unanimously

Motion: Approve the School of Nursing Readmission Criteria (19:243)

Made by: Joseph Gustafson

Second: Bonnie Galinski

Courtney Orelup initiated the discussion by explaining how and why the policy was developed and went over the specifications of the policy.

Megan Miller suggested broadening the criteria covering what led students to initially separate from the program: "...for nursing students who separated from the program due to withdrawal from the university or the program, nursing course failures or science course failures (refer to the..."

The discussion turned to the 5 criteria that the policy listed and it was pointed out that criteria #4 ("Space available in the School of Nursing.") and #5 ("A student may only apply for re-admission to the nursing program once") were requirements of the program, not things that students had to accomplish. It was decided that the language should be made more specific as to exactly how it would be determined which students were selected to re-enter the program, as completion of requirements 1-3 would not guarantee students re-admission to the program.

Courtney Orelup stated that she would prefer to bring the suggested changes back to the nursing program for discussion and that they would submit a revised proposal.

Motion: table the discussion of 19:243

Made by: Bonnie Galinski

Seconded: Becky Martini

Vote: motion passes unanimously

Motion to Approve the School of Nursing Criteria for Change of Major/Internal Transfer Students (19:244)

Made by: Minesha Washington

Seconded: Lamont Simmons

Courtney Orelup introduced the policy with some background on how and why it originated (outlined in the Rationale section of the proposal). Megan Miller pointed out that there are often a limited number of spots for a larger number of interested students and that the language should be clarified as to how the decisions are made for who is accepted. Peter Walker inquired if Courtney Orelup feels comfortable handling the language change in the committee and she affirmed. Peter Walker then requested that Megan Miller suggest amended language for this section:

"Otherwise academically qualified students are not guaranteed admission into the School of Nursing. Available spaces will be offered to students with the highest academic qualifications."

	<p>Motion: amend proposal with suggested language provided by Megan Miller Made by: Sarah Mana Seconded: Annette Chapman-Adisho Vote: ammendment passes unanimously</p> <p>Discussion returns to the entire proposal, and a few typographical errors are addressed.</p> <p>VOTE: Motion passes with one abstention</p> <p>Motion to change proposal 19:238 (Global Engagement Seal) from postponed to table. Made by: Becky Martini Seconded: Kathy Fahey VOTE: Motion passes unanimously</p>
<p>IV.</p>	<p>New Business None.</p>
<p>V.</p>	<p>Adjournment</p> <p>Motion to adjourn. Motion made by: Cody Sears Seconded by: Elisa Castillo</p> <p>VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.</p>
<p>Adjourned</p>	<p>at 4:30 p.m.</p>

Respectfully submitted,
 Kristin Pangallo

Next Meeting: February 21, 2019 (Presidential Conference Room)

Academic Calendar Summaries

	2019-2020		2020-2021	
	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Teaching Days	66	72	64	70
Adv/Read/Exam Days	10	10	9	10
# T/H class meetings	27	30	28	29
# W/F class meetings	27	30	27	29
# Mondays	12	12	13	12
# Tuesdays	14	15	14	15
# Wednesdays	14	15	13	15
# Thursdays	13	15	14	14
# Fridays	13	15	14	14
Instructional Days	158		157	
Teaching Start Date	Fall: after Labor Day (9/4) Spring: before MLK Day (1/13)		Fall: before Labor Day (9/2) Spring: after MLK Day (1/19)	
Between Semesters	7 business days from Jan 3-13 (10 calendar days)		10 business days from Jan 3-19 (16 calendar days)	
	Guidelines specify calendar days in #6&7, but in #10 specify that Winter Recess “may not end sooner than the 9 th day following January 3, no including Saturdays, Sundays and holidays.” Do ‘business days’ better describe this condition?			
Commencement	Commencement occurs only 2 days after final exams finish. Guideline #12 states that there should be at least 4 days here.			

If we were to start after Labor Day in the Fall 2020 semester we would sacrifice 4 teaching days, though we could count those as Advising Days, as per Guideline #3. However, this would mean that we would have 26 T/H classes and only 25 W/F classes, which is substantially fewer than the spring semester in a typical year (effectively a two week difference). Classes that met only on Wednesdays would be particularly impacted (only 12 meetings).