

1-29-2021

## Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate 2021-01-29

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee

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

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee, "Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate 2021-01-29" (2021). *All Committee Minutes*. 407.  
[https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins/407](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/407)

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), [mschlangen1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlangen1@udayton.edu).

APC Minutes  
January 29, 2021

**Committee Members: Phil Anloague, Deb Bickford, Connie Bowman, Trevor Collier, Michael Davies, Mary Ellen Dillon, Jim Dunne, Laura Hume, Jason Pierce, Maher Qumsiyeh, Andrew Sarangan, and Tereza Szeghi (chair). Bolded are present.**

1. Approval of [minutes](#) from November 13 meeting. Approved by Maher, seconded by Laura. Six approved, one abstained.
2. Welcome to our new committee members: [Trevor Collier](#) and Laura Hume!
3. Discussion of the status of the draft transfer credit policy/concerns raised at Academic Senate before the document was tabled.
  - a. Is there more precise language we might use to address CAP?
    - i. Many people are asking questions about this. People expected to see more guidelines from CAP. This seems to be big.
    - ii. It is a big and complicated issue. Jim stated that he hoped the Senate would be able to review the CAP document.
    - iii. Is the “approved guidance” transferring authority to the Provost office (in what was “g” in the document-- any thoughts on this? We had heard that the latest is in the Provost Office being considered.
    - iv. Will the Senate have a role in approving the transfer policy for CAP?
    - v. Tereza met with Joe V on Tuesday about this issue.
    - vi. The transfers are decisions made by dean’s offices and departments, not the Provost’s Council.
  - b. Does the decision to get rid of the term “transient” (and use “transfer” only when discussing credits from other institutions) raise any substantive issues?
    - i. Perhaps a footnote or a phrase could be added to include “transient” in the definition of transfer.
    - ii. We could make an addition to the definition of transfer, or the context section of the document could claim this.
  - c. Are there other places where we should mention international transfers?
  - d. What is our best approach for preparing for the next Senate meeting regarding this document?
  - e. Other?
    - i. Jim suggested that there could be a section called Background or History that would have some clarifying information-- contextualize the document. It is something that we would write.
    - ii. Clarify that when we refer to the dean’s office, it is the dean’s office of the course, not the dean’s office of the student in “f”.
    - iii. Clarify the distinction between acceptance and application of credit in “f”. Should there be more clarification provided? Who will decide if it is accepted? Tereza will review where it says applied and accepted to see where clarification might be needed
      1. We need to get some clarity from Phyllis and the Dean’s offices. We are trying to develop a data base to clarify both acceptance and

**Commented [1]:** Tereza will review where it says applied and accepted to see where clarification might be needed @tszeghi1 @udayton.edu  
\_Assigned to Tereza Szeghi\_

application. There are different standards in different units for the application of credit. Maybe another sentence could clarify this. Tereza will reach out to Phyllis.

2. We agreed that the dean's office of the course determines acceptance, and the dean's office of the student determines applicability. There might still be some nuance in this.
  3. Tereza will make a rough draft of the context section and some edits; we will not be meeting next Friday, so we will need to work on this virtually.
  4. Trevor suggested splitting f into two separate sections, one for acceptance and the other for application.
- iv. We should be clear about the status of the CAP transfer task force recommendations because Senators will ask about that when this comes up again.
  - v. One reviewer suggested that we have language about no guarantees on "e." The last sentence under "e"-- should it be added to "c" and "d" as well? One solution would be to separate out acceptance and application, then things will apply to everything subsumed under each of those sections. We could either delete what is in "e," or move up the "no guarantee of application" to all the statements embedded under.
  - vi. In the list of definitions, the last one should be moved up to the top-- transfer credit definition should be first, then acceptance, then application. Put them in logical order, not alphabetical order.
  - vii. If other things come up about the draft policy, please let Tereza know.
4. Adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

**Commented [2]:** Tereza will make a rough draft of the context section and some edits; we will not be meeting next Friday, so we will need to work on this virtually.  
@tszeghi1@udayton.edu  
\_Assigned to Tereza Szeghi\_