

8-29-2007

## Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2007-08-29

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 2007-08-29" (2007). *All Committee Minutes*. Paper 115.  
[http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins/115](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/115)

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).

## **APC Minutes 29 August 2007--Unapproved**

Present: Bickford, Benson, Bowman, Darrow (chair), Diestelkamp, Duncan, Eggemeier, Jipson, Patterson, Penno

Excused: O’Gorman, Saliba, Seielstad

Guest: Biers

### 1. Proposal to create a special HIR subcommittee

The first item of business was a discussion of the proposal to create a subcommittee of the APC to providing a draft plan for creating a common academic program based on the learning outcomes in Habits of Inquiry and Reflection. The chair noted that one of the members who could not attend the meeting had expressed concerns about shifting away from the working groups. The other members of the committee noted that they had read the member’s concerns. There was a consensus in the committee that, for all their merits, the working groups could not produce the desired result (a draft program for a common undergraduate academic program) for review by the APC in a timely fashion. One member also noted that the smaller composition of the subcommittee (as opposed to the working groups) would add transparency to the process by providing an easily identifiable small set of individuals to which persons interested in providing input to the process might turn.

At the same time, the committee expressed its concern that steps be taken to a) thank those who had agreed to serve on a working groups for their time and b) assure them that the review procedure change did not mean that their voices would not be heard. To this end, the committee instructed the chair to draft a letter (not an e-mail) to the working group members that thanks them for their willingness to serve and invites them to a meeting where they can express any concerns they might have. The chair agreed to do this.

Discussion then turned to the proposed composition of the subcommittee, beginning with its chair. Much of the discussion revolved around the political implications of the subcommittee’s composition and the divisional affiliation of the subcommittee chair. The APC chair reminded the committee that the subcommittee was being charged to write a draft for further discussion and approval by the APC and, ultimately, the full Senate. In other words, the subcommittee’s report would not be the final word and the only opportunity for input into the process. It would, rather, be just a beginning.

From this discussion, four names emerged as persons with the experience, collaborative spirit and institutional perspective needed to chair the subcommittee. The APC instructed the chair to inquire with each nominee’s dean as to whether or not he or she believed that chairing the subcommittee would interfere with the nominee’s divisional obligations. After securing the deans’ opinions, the APC chair is then to ask each nominee if they would be willing to chair the subcommittee. The APC then agreed that it would choose the subcommittee chair from those nominees that agreed to serve.

The APC also directed the chair to solicit from the deans a list of nominees to fill the other positions on the subcommittee. The APC agreed to use these lists as a basis for filling the other positions.

Regarding the actual charge to the subcommittee, the members of the APC suggested that the charge include an instruction for the subcommittee to prioritize the various component parts of its work and report its decision to the APC. The chair agreed to add language to this effect to the charge. There was a consensus that the charge rightly included a requirement for the subcommittee to consult widely, but that listing specific bodies or individuals for consultation was problematic. The committee suggested that such specific references be deleted from the charge and that the word “those” be changed to “key stakeholders.” The APC, in its review of the subcommittee’s activity, progress and final reports, will ensure that the subcommittee is following its charge to be widely consultative. The chair agreed to make these changes.

The committee noted that the proposed timetable was beyond ambitious, bordering on unreasonable, and certainly unrealistic. At the same time, there was a consensus that the pace of this preliminary work needed to move faster. President Biers offered to ask the Provost for some sort of monetary support for the subcommittee as a means of moving its work forward, but also noted that the proposed dates were unrealistic. The committee agreed that the October start date for fortnightly activity reports to the APC should remain October 2007, and that the December 2007 due date for a Progress report was reasonable. The members, however, agreed that the date for a final report to the APC be changed to September 2008 and that the date for APC submission of a final version of the plan to the full Senate be eliminated from the charge.

The APC chair agreed to make all these changes and submit the revised charge to the committee for approval.

## 2. Proposal to change reporting of “in-progress” grades

The committee unanimously supported the proposal to change the reporting of “in progress” grades from “P” to “IP”