

11-21-2011

## Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2011-11-21

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee, "Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2011-11-21" (2011). *All Committee Minutes*. Paper 90.  
[http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins/90](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/90)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact [frice1@udayton.edu](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu).

**Approved**  
**Minutes of the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate**  
**11/21/11**  
**KU 207**

**Present:** Megan Abbate, Paul Benson, Jim Dunne, Vinod Jain, Laura Leming, Leno Pedrotti, Carolyn Phelps, John White

**Absent:** Joe Castellano, Deb Bickford, Emily Kaylor, Tony Saliba

**Guest:** Brad Duncan

**Minutes approved:** Minutes of the 10/24/11 meeting were approved.

**Announcements:** none

**Old Business. Program Development Process.**

Final changes and edits were reviewed. Document with changes as described was voted on and given unanimous support.

**New Business.** Brad Duncan, Associate Dean of Graduate, Professional, and Continuing Education presented three proposals to the APC: Graduate Retake Policy; Guidelines for the Development of Bachelor's Plus Master's (BPM) Degree Programs; Graduate Academic Standards and Progress Policy.

Retake policy. Overall, the committee appeared supportive of the document but raised several points that needed to be further clarified. Jain questioned whether a student would need permission in order to retake one course. Abbate pointed out that if permission is required, criteria for that permission may be necessary. Duncan stated that the intent of the policy was that permission was solely at the discretion of the relevant program director. Pedrotti pointed out that some courses such as special topics may have the same course number but different content. The document should specify that the retake is with respect to course content. The question was also raised whether "one course" reflected three credit hours or one individual course. It was recommended that the policy be more clear that it applies to one course regardless of number of credit hours involved. It was also pointed out that the document should be clear regarding retake with grade replacement and retake without. Pedrotti asked if the policy could be implemented with current graduate students or whether it would only apply to those who entered following passage of the policy. Duncan clarified that it could be implemented immediately. Duncan also stated that the policy set a leniency bound, departments could have more stringent policies. Duncan will resubmit the document with recommended changes

Guidelines for the Development of Bachelor's Plus Master's (BPM) Degree Programs. This action is consultation. It was pointed out that Doc 10-01 already addresses this issue; however, the practice is not consistent with policy. The purpose of this proposal is to change the policy to fit the practice. It was pointed out that an amendment to 10-01 may be the preferred so that there would not be two inconsistent documents. The question was also raised about how the retake policy that was just discussed would impact students in a BPM program. Duncan clarified that courses taken for graduate credit would fall

under the new policy and those taken for undergraduate credit would fall under the guidelines for retakes of undergraduate courses. Duncan will amend Doc 10-01 and bring this to the APC again.

Standards and Progress Policy. Again, several questions were raised. There was a question of what constituted a “term.” Duncan clarified that a term was no less than one semester and no longer than one year. Another question raised involved a course, what would a student do if the course was only offered every other year? This needs to be clarified. Leming asked about the role of the department in the initiation of dismissal and if there was an appeal process. Benson clarified that appeals take place through the deans’ offices. White raised a concern about the breadth of consultation with the document. He stated that there were some concerns in SOEAP had not been sufficiently consulted. It was decided that the document would be tabled in the APC until further consultation with faculty in SOEAP could take place.

Meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Carolyn Roecker Phelps