ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
2019-2020 Summary Report
Submitted by Deeanna Button, Chair
May 2020

Committee Members: Deeanna Button (Chair), Robin Hernandez-Mekonnen (Vice-Chair), David Reiser, Carla Cabarle, Ron Tinsley, Geoffrey Gust, Sequetta Sweet, Carole-Rae Reed, Kerry Chang, Emma Wiit, Kimberley Schanz, Tom Grites (Ex Officio), Amy Beth Glass (Ex Officio), Marissa Levy (Ex Officio)

The APC met eight times during the 2019-2020 AY. The APC discussed the following charges:
1. Bulletin Policy and Procedure
2. Academic Program Proposal, Maintenance, and Closure (formally Life Cycle of Degree) Policy and Procedure Review
3. Academic Honesty Procedure 2005
4. Academic Dismissal Proposal
5. Additional policies/procedures

Additional items to address:
1. APC Request for Consideration Form
2. Committee Attendance

1. Bulletin Policy and Procedure
   a. Neither a policy nor procedure existed for the Bulletin, despite it being a complex practice that involves many different actors. The committee was in favor of creating a new policy and procedure to formalize the Bulletin purpose and process.
      i. The role of the Degree Works program should be specified in the policy and procedure.
      ii. Degree requirements outlaid in the Bulletin at the beginning of the academic year (Fall) will apply to students who enter in the Spring and Summer of that academic year.
      iii. Information on the website promoting upcoming changes should specify when changes will be implemented. This would typically be the next year, and the Bulletin should supersede any information on the website.
      iv. The procedure should clarify when and how students should be notified of changes.
      v. Many programs only update the website once a year, so neither the bulletin nor website may reflect the most accurate information for recruiting new students. Consider ways to ensure that information used for marketing is most update to date.
   b. **Motion: The APC recommends accepting the proposed Bulletin Policy and Procedure after suggested revisions are addressed.**
      In Favor: 7, Opposed: 0, Abstain 0
      Robin motioned; Emma seconded.

2. **Academic Program Proposal, Maintenance, and Closure (formally Life Cycle of Degree) Policy and Procedure Review**
   a. The name change from Life Cycle of Degree Program to Academic Program Proposal, Maintenance, and Closure was proposed to provide more clarification on what the policy and procedure covered. Effort was made to provide more detail in each of the steps for program proposal.
   b. The role of the Academic Program and Planning Committee (APP), a standing committee of the Senate, was discussed. The proposed revision substantially changes the nature of how APP has historically operated. Historically, the APP has had the power to block proposals from moving forward in the review process. The new policy/procedure indicates that the APP would review the proposal twice and then provide either a positive or negative recommendation to the full Senate. Under this, the executive committee would retain the power to prevent full Senate review of a proposal.
      i. The APC stated that if there is to be a role change in the APP, then it should not occur by default of implementing new policy/procedure. Instead, the role change should go through the Senate first, and then be reflected in policies and procedures.
      ii. The committee raised the question of whether the APP's practice was in-line with the Senate's operating procedures. Standing committees of the Senate typically provide recommendations only.
   c. Notable recommendations for the Policy:
      i. Note what is/is not listed on official transcripts.
      ii. **Motion: The APC recommends the implementation of the Academic Program Proposal, Maintenance, and Closure Policy and moves to forward the document to the full Faculty Senate for review.**
         Motion made by Kim; Seconded by Emma
         Online Faculty Vote: 7 in-favor, 0 not in-favor, and 0 abstain. 4 did not vote.
   d. Notable recommendations for Procedure:
      i. Create a glossary at the beginning of document to define all terms/acronyms.
      ii. At the first use of the term/acronym in the text, spell out entirely and then use abbreviated version moving forward
      iii. Provide fewer details about the role and procedures of the APP
      iv. Consolidate all FYI information to FYI section
      v. Add a list of examples of who sits on the Provost's Council
      vi. Add a table of contents with hyper-links so readers can directly link to relevant information.
      vii. **Motion: The APC recommends the implementation of the Academic Program Proposal, Maintenance, and Closure Procedure and moves to forward the document to the full Faculty Senate for review.**
         Motion made by Emma; Seconded by Kim
         Online Faculty Vote: 7 in-favor, 0 not in-favor, and 1 abstain. 3 did not vote

3. **Academic Honesty Procedure 2005**
   a. The committee reviewed the most current draft of the Academic Honesty Procedure.
   b. There was consensus to remove the "An Example of Paraphrasing" text that cites Purdue Owl. Purdue Owl is not kept up to date. Text to recommend students to their discipline specific style will be added.
   c. Faculty again noted the concern in not having a mandatory disciplinary sanction for the second offense. Potential options for disciplinary sanctions that can be recommended by faculty will be added to the rubric.
   d. **Motion: The committee recommends that the university adopt the edited version of the Academic Honesty Procedure**.
      Motion made by Robin; seconded by Geoff
      In favor: 9, Opposed: 0, Abstained: 0
   e. The committee reviewed a proposed resolution on Academic Honesty Online Tutorial with eVerification.
      i. Provost's appointees recommended that the Faculty Senate create a working-group to recommend existing models or a newly created model of an online tutorial to the Provost's Office.
      ii. **Motion: The committee recommends adopting the revised resolution on Academic Honesty Online Tutorial with eVerification.**
         Motion made by Deeanna; seconded by Kim
         In favor: 9, Opposed: 0, Abstained: 0
   f. The committee reviewed a draft of the Academic Dishonesty Report Form.
      i. The report form should include information fields with different text/drop-down boxes that are consistent with what is required in the Procedure.
      ii. **Motion: The APC moved to recommend the use of the Violation of Academic Honesty Report Form.**
         Motion made by Emma, seconded by Kim
         In-favor 6, Not in-favor 0, Abstain 0
   g. The committee reviewed the sanctioning rubric.
      i. Use a list of potential options for disciplinary sanctions.
      ii. Conduct an information campaign, starting with the Fall faculty conference to clarify what are requirements of the procedure vs what are recommendations.
      iii. Provide students with information about potential sanctions in the online training.
      iv. **Motion: The APC moved to recommend use of the Academic Honesty Violation Rubric.**
         Motion made by Robin, seconded by Geoff
         In-favor 6, Not in-favor 0, Abstain 0

4. **Dismissal Proposal (Policy II-17 and Procedure 2019)**
   a. The APC reviewed the larger context of changes presented in the concept paper by Peter Hagan. The most significant change proposed was moving to a system of dismissal based on quality point deficiency (QPD) rather than just GPA. Because of timing, it was not possible to work through recommendations regarding adopting the QPD system of dismissal. The APC requested that the Provost's Office identity aspects of the policy/procedure that are especially time sensitive. The Provost's office identified two priorities for the APC—Provost's final determination for all dismissals and reinstatement and use of rematriculation form.
   b. **Provost's final determination for all DISMISSALS**
      i. Currently, cases for dismissal are cued by Banner when a student has a GPA below 2.0. The Provost's Office gets a list that is currently reviewed to assure that Banner is correct (it is not a perfect system) and provides discretion on a case-by-case basis.
      ii. The proposed change would be an administrative change/notation regarding who ultimately makes the decision to dismiss. The process in which dismissal occurs would remain the same for all programs except FRST. Academic criteria for dismissal would remain unchanged. No other changes would be made in the process of dismissal.
      iii. Historically, FRST handled dismissal of students who have not passed FRST courses with a C or better in two attempts. The proposed change would shift current FRST practice from determining dismissals to recommending dismissals to the Provost, who would have final say.
         a. The FRST program has a unique competency requirement that is required by university policy 2031. The competency requirement can be met by 1) SAT/ACT scores upon admission, 2) transferring in related courses from other universities/colleges, or 3) successfully passing FRST courses with a C in two attempts.
         b. Competency requirement for FRST is different than other courses; it has always been two tries, but students can appeal for third try. They have two tries to pass the course because they need to demonstrate basic competency in their first year so they can continue onto their other courses. But, they actually have three attempts to meet the requirement. The first attempt is with standardized tests and/or the accu-placer test. Second and third attempts are from FRST courses.
         c. FRST has ample steps/procedures/practices that are in place to support students in these classes, both during their first and second attempts. If they do not pass on second attempt, students can appeal, and most students who appeal are granted the appeal.
            a. FRST has noted that only 5% of students who attempt FRST courses for a third time successfully graduate.
            b. There is concern that an automatic third attempt would put already marginalized students in greater debt. FRST has also noted that there is high demand for these classes and allowing

students to attempt a third time automatically adds additional burden to the FRST program because they already do not have enough resources.

    iv. Given the complexity of FRST faculty involvement in students success, the APC finds it essential that FRST faculty should have the opportunity to discuss FRST dismissals with the Office of the Provost before final determination is made. This concern has been reflected in the Procedure (V-A-1) where it is noted "in cases where there is disagreement between FRST faculty recommendations and the Provost's final determination consultation between the two parties will occur."

    v. The Provost's final determination does not overturn the competency requirement. Students would still have to complete the competency requirement. If the Provost's overturns a recommendation for dismissal after two unsuccessful attempts at FRST courses, it would allow the student additional time/semester to meet the requirement.

    vi. The issue of reduced liability for faculty was highlighted. When the Provost makes the final decision, faculty are not liable. The decision can be backed by the Provost's Office and the university's legal counsel, if necessary.

    vii. **Motion: The APC recommends change to Policy II-17 that allows the Provost final institutional authority to dismiss students from the University**.
9 in-favor, 0 not in favor, 0 abstain, 2 did not respond

    viii. **Motion: The APC recommends change to Procedure 2019 that allows the Provost final institutional authority to dismiss students from the University.**
9 in-favor, 0 not in favor, 0 abstain, 2 did not respond

c. **Provost's final determination for all REINSTATEMENTS**

    i. The APC did not have as robust of a conversation regarding changes that would impact reinstatement. It was noted that with the proposed change, faculty would not make recommendations about reinstatement for academic dismissal (dismissal triggered by low GPA); this would be determined by Provost's Office only and is current practice.

    ii. **Motion: The APC recommends change to Procedure 2019 that allows the Provost final institutional authority to reinstate students.**
9 in-favor, 0 not in favor, 0 abstain, 2 did not respond

d. **Require students who are out of the university system for two or more semesters to fill out a rematriculation form**

    i. The change is administrative in asking students who are out more than two semesters to fill out the rematriculation form. The rematriculation form has been updated to include questions about misdemeanors or felonies. This question has also been added to the admissions application. The addition of the question to admissions and the rematriculation form is a mandated, university-wide change. Having students fill out the rematriculation after a two or more semester absence ensures we are able to get this information from them.

      ii. **Motion: The APC recommends change to Procedure 2019 that requires dismissed students who are away from the university for more than two semesters to submit a rematriculation form to the Office of the Registrar.** 9 in-favor, 0 not in favor, 0 intentionally abstain, 2 did not respond

   e. Note that these discussions were somewhat rushed, and became more difficult to have over zoom. While the APC supports these motions and changes, we do ask that the <u>Senate Exec and the Full Senate carefully review changes to ensure faculty concerns are addressed fully</u>.

5. In Fall 2020, the APC will move the QPD conversation forward.

   a. The APC requests more information on:

      i. The cohort effect—are the increased dismissals from the university, and particularly related to FRST, from the influx of students that were admitted when we needed to boost enrollments?

      ii. Reinstatement success—once reinstated, how many successfully graduate?

      iii. How other schools use similar QPD methods? Currently, there is a list of schools offered in the concept paper, but no details about what or how they actually use this.

      iv. Detailed flow charts on the step-by-step process that the student participates in for the list below. General information that would be helpful for each includes, but is not limited to: what triggers it, how is the student notified, what is the timeline, who/when do they meet with, what players are involved, what happens if they don't participate in any given step, what occurs at each step (i.e., meeting with Academic Advising, what is discussed, what information does the student receive—verbally and in written form), how many participate at that stage, and what happens if they don't?

         a. Dismissal

         b. Appeals process

         c. Reinstatement

         d. Support services and/or requirements for students leading up to dismissal, during the appeal process, and at reinstatement. How many actually use each of these services?

      v. The APC will continue discussion on the following points:

         a. The pros and cons of switching to a QPD dismissal system and whether it is right for Stockton.

         b. Admissions standards—are we admitting college prepared students? If not, will these changes help?

         c. The QPD thresholds and whether to set a minimum GPA requirement (e.g., 1.0)

         d. Mandating that students drop to 12 credits prior to dismissal and after reinstatement, and consider charging them by credit, rather than flat rate.

         e. The impact of support services on students—does it help or create more burden for busy students who are already struggling to manage multiple responsibilities?

        f. Dismissal for Seniors—thoughts on dismissing a student who is one semester, class, etc. away from a degree because of one terrible semester? Is the proposed plan catching those who have continuously done poorly, or does it dismiss those who have met minimum progress along the way, but had one terrible semester towards the end?

        g. Dismissing students for two terms—excluding summer—before allowing reinstatement.

        h. Recommendations on including preceptors in the process and how to communicate the QPD changes

      vi. The committee requests information and feedback from:

        a. Interim Provost's (Michelle McDonald)

        b. Heather McGovern, PC of FRST

        c. HLTH Sciences, particularly the PC of Nursing regarding how these changes may affect accreditation requirements or clinical requirements.

6. Additional policies/procedures

    a. The APC briefly discussed several additional policies and procedures, but these conversations were put on hold to prioritize the Academic Dismissal and Reinstatement Proposal.

    b. **Registration Policy (II-6.1)**

      i. The APC made slight modifications to include information on graduate students. Initially, a motion was made to implement the policy. After the vote was sent out, a concern was raised regarding the new imposition of late fees. There was a motion and second to suspend the vote on the original motion. The motion passed and we will resume conversation on this in the Fall.

    c. **Remission of Out-of-State Tuition for Certain Foreign Nationals Policy (II-6.3)**

      i. The APC requested clarification on the following statement: "Remission of out-of-state tuition may be granted to eligible foreign nationals numbering up to one percent of the anticipated Full-Time Equivalency (FTE) enrollment." Does this mean students will receive remission to in-state tuition or if they will receive remission from all tuition. What about fees? Do students pay all fees? Or are they remitted too?

    d. **Residency Defined for Tuition Purposes Policy (II-6.4)**

      i. Under "Foreign Nationals" section, clarification about what remission means in terms of tuition and fees is needed. Is it 100% remission, or is it remission to in-state tuition/fees. Does this apply to both tuition and fees?

      ii. Under "Determination of Residency", the APC requests clarification on what criteria are used to make a determination of a student's resident status; updated information for new titles of offices that handle admissions for undergrad and graduate students; and clarification on how the appeal process works, and who the players are.

       iii.   The APC recommends considering create a policy and procedure for Residency Defined for Tuition Purposes.

   e. **Student Records Policy (II-91)--Labeled as F in Policy II-(6&91) folder**

       i.   The APC needs to review the associated procedure in conjunction with the policy to provide more substantive feedback.

Additional Items to Address

1. **APC Request for Consideration Form:** To expedite the review process, the APC requires a request for consideration form that asks users to provide contextual information about requests, the rationale for the modification/addition, and any intended and unintended consequences that may result. The form can be found here: https://goo.gl/forms/VcTpyDDXNaKOzPyE3

2. **Attendance:** The APC is comprised of 14 members, 11 of which are faculty. Often times, faculty attendance is poor. The lack of faculty attendance compromises the collective voice. As Stockton continues to grow and change, our committee has an increasing number of charges, and these charges are becoming more substantive in nature. It is imperative that the APC be compromised of active and present members, so the committee is not dominated by members of the committee who are not faculty.

       i.   To address this concern, the APC moved meetings outside of the 4:30pm meeting module to reduce competition with other meetings and foster work-life balance.

       ii.   In the Spring, an alternative meeting time via zoom was held for those who could not make the main meeting.

       iii.   It would be helpful to discuss other possible solutions including elected alternate representatives, reaching out to school deans to encourage participation or finding a stand-in rep for schedule conflicts, and/or standing committee attendance policies.