

3-6-2006

Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2006-02-06

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee, "Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2006-02-06" (2006). *All Committee Minutes*. Paper 113.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/113

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.

[Approved March 6, 2006]

Academic Policies Committee
Approved Minutes
February 6, 2006

Members Present: J. Biddle, B. Conniff, C. Duncan, D. Gudaitis, M. Morton, J. O’Gorman, R. Penno, J. Saliba, L. Simmons, S. Singer, R. Wells
Ex-officio: Deb Bickford
Faculty Board Liaison: Mark Patterson

ACTIONS

1. Approved minutes of APC meeting of January 23, 2006.
2. Approved a revision in the Withdrawal policy. With a unanimous vote, the APC approved the following: **“During this period, a W will be permitted only for special nonacademic reasons. These include, but are not limited to, poor personal health, financial difficulties, and family matters of health. Documentation may be required.”** The current withdrawal policy set out in the Bulletin includes a “change in career objectives” in the category of “special nonacademic reasons” under which a dean’s office may grant a late withdrawal. This poses a problem for deans’ offices because it is not consonant with other examples given (e.g., health issues and financial difficulties), and because it is a commonly used excuse for poor academic performance.

DISCUSSION

1. Class rank

Accurate and reliable processes, definitions, and guidelines for establishing class rank are not available. No undergraduate academic unit now uses or distributes a student’s class rank. The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers recommends that class rank not be used on transcripts because of confusing issues and questions related to defining class rank. ARSIC presented a rationale for their recommendation that a brief policy statement be placed in the Bulletin indicating that the University of Dayton does not rank its students. The APC will discuss this issue at its next meeting.

2. University P & T committee

Throughout the twentieth century, faculty cultures on colleges and universities have been most dramatically changed by one process--changing the P & T policies. "Hiring for mission" strategies are relatively impotent unless buttressed by "P & T for mission." The Board of Trustees and Provost have instituted possible changes to UD's P & T system. A committee met Fall 2005 to frame a working draft of the new process; an expanded committee has taken up that work for Winter 2006.

The first issue on the draft statement is: "The [university-wide P&T] Committee will have responsibility for reviewing the guidelines for P&T for all academic units within the University. The Committee will review those guidelines to ensure that they define appropriate substantive and procedural criteria and are consistent with other University policies on P&T. The Committee also will ensure that substantive expectations for P&T are explicitly stated within all University P&T guidelines." Without doubt, the most difficult issue facing the process relates to “substantive

consistency of criteria across all units." At APC's next meeting, we will how setting/determining "appropriate substantive criteria" should be accomplished?