

Academic Policies Committee

Minutes

15 August 2019

Minutes approved: September 27, 2019

In Attendance: Agnieszka Chwialkowska, Nancy Penco, Soo Moon, Emily McKendry-Smith, Gavin Lee, Yun Cheng (proxy for Michael Hopper), Jairus-Joaquin Matthews, Ethel Santiago, Jean Cook, Donna Haley, Ashley Lewis, Jill Drake, Logan Taulien, Justin Barlow, Jennifer Jordan

The meeting began at 11:00 AM.

- I. Minutes
 - a. The minutes from the February 19, 2019 meeting were approved without corrections.

- II. Election of the note taker
 - a. Emily McKendry-Smith was unanimously elected as note-taker. It was agreed that, if necessary, the committee will revisit this decision and possibly consider a rotating note-taker.

- III. Academic Renewal Policy Proposal
 - a. Jennifer Jordan reported on UWG's Academic Renewal Policy. A USG working group on academic renewal policies created the USG policy in 2016. UWG's sister institutions have adopted the shortest period of time before academic renewal can occur (3 years). UWG has adopted the longest period of time (5 years). UWG's sister institutions are also accepting transfer credit in a way that UWG is not.
 - b. It was proposed that UWG's time period for academic renewal be 3 years and that transfer credit be accepted.
 - c. There was a discussion about the phrase "absence of three calendar years from any postsecondary institution."
 - a. The possibility was raised that students may earn credit from a technical college or an institution like University of Phoenix during those 3 years.
 - b. The Georgia Southern policy states that students can receive "academic renewal for coursework taken 3 or more years prior..."
 - c. The proposed UWG policy will be reworded to clarify that this is what we intend.
 - d. The USG website notes that courses taken during the period of absence are ineligible for renewal but that transfer credit may be awarded.
 - e. The USG system also has a FAQ page about applying for renewal.

- d. Discussion ensued that UWG's policy is much more restrictive than those of other USG institutions, such as Georgia Southern.
 - a. The goal of this revision is to clean up the UWG policy.
 - b. Our peer institutions are interpreting the policy differently and UWG policy is not currently in line with other institutions.
- e. The committee voted unanimously to table this item until the next meeting.

IV. Adult Transfer Policy

- a. Jennifer Jordan explained a proposed 2-tier policy for adult transfer admissions:
 - Tier 1: for adults with less than 30 transfer credits, keep the existing policy.
 - Tier 2: for adults with more than 30 transfer credits and proof of proficiency in math and English, remove remediation requirements.
- b. Discussion ensued about how "proficiency" is determined – through grades in transfer coursework.
- c. Discussion of language – what is the definition of adult vs. transfer vs. nontraditional student
 - i. Justin Barlow recommends using the term "non-traditional" in this policy.
- d. Issue of transfer GPAs – who will determine this on a case-by-case basis?
 - i. Justin Barlow notes that we are allowed to make exceptions for adults using the appeals committee.
 - ii. Current appeals process requires 2 recommendation letters and an essay. This is intended for recent high school graduates, not nontraditional students.
 - iii. It would be ideal to have a subcommittee where adult learners don't need to turn in this type of material. The subcommittee could conduct reviews.
 - iv. We want to help adults enroll, but we also want to support them.
- e. The issue was raised that 2 tier policy is not reflected in the proposed catalog revision.
 - i. General transfer policy applies to anyone with prior learning. There will be a sub-set of this policy for non-traditional students with the 2 tiers.
- f. The committee voted unanimously to table this item until the next meeting.

V. Restricting students from minoring in the same area as one's major

- a. Jill Drake discussed the need for this restriction (i.e., so a Sociology major cannot also declare a Sociology minor).
- b. The policy needs to be able to tease out situations to which this restriction shouldn't apply, such as English majors minoring in Creative Writing.
- c. Discussion ensued of the line in proposed policy "sufficiently diverse as with different titles."

- d. Currently, the policy draft states that no courses can be counted toward both a major and a minor.
- e. Possible option of requiring X hours of distinct courses was discussed as a way of defining “sufficiently diverse.”
 - i. The issue was raised of how this might impact interdisciplinary minors.
 - ii. It is unclear how to come up with minimum hours of distinct courses.
- f. A possible option was suggested that students cannot minor in something that would involve coursework that is potentially applicable to their major.
- g. The issue has also come up in the past that students want to return to UWG just to do a minor – this has been addressed in the catalog.
- h. BOR policy may be helpful for addressing this issue. In the BOR policy, a major refers to a very specific thing with a very specific title.
 - i. The line about “sufficiently diverse as with different titles” is not necessary.
- i. With changes, the proposed policy now reads “Students are prohibited from seeking a minor with the same title as their major or concentration. Under no circumstances may a course count toward a major and a minor.”
- j. The proposed policy passes unanimously.

VI. Policy Modification to Post-Tenure Review

- a. Jill Drake explained the need for revisions to this policy:
 - i. Some language in the policy says “stellar” while other places in the policy use the language of “satisfactory” vs. “unsatisfactory.”
 - ii. The post-tenure review committee is not charged with having “stellar” as a rating but need to determine if someone is “stellar” or not.
- b. Discussion ensued whether or not “stellar” could be defined by the Faculty Development Committee or the colleges or the departments.
- c. Discussion of using language of meeting/exceeding expectations instead of “stellar.”
 - i. Would require changing the language of both stellar and unsatisfactory/satisfactory.
- d. The issue behind this policy is that the university will recognize amazing work in some sort of monetary way.
 - i. Is “exceeds expectations” fantastic enough to get at what the policy is speaking to?
- e. Issue of consistency with annual review language and language used in staff evaluations was discussed.
- f. The point was raised that this policy could also be used to address salary compression.

- g. Discussion ensued that chairs have the option of going up for post-tenure review; the faculty handbook says the chairs “will” and this needs to be changed to “may.”
- h. Issue was raised that deans have no role in post-tenure evaluation. There is a need to consider deans potentially having a role.
 - i. Tenure decisions go to the deans. Doing the same for post-tenure review would create uniformity and consistency across years and policies.
 - ii. The language for 3rd year review and promotion and tenure will be reviewed regarding the dean’s role.
 - iii. Jill Drake will also take this up with the deans.
- i. The committee voted unanimously to table this item until the next meeting.

VII. Meeting scheduling

- a. Agnieszka Chwialkowska will send out a survey so that the committee can schedule a specific date to meet each month.

VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 12:16 PM.