

Academic Policies Committee

Minutes

15 November 2019

Minutes approved:

In Attendance: Agnieszka Chwialkowska, Nancy Pencoe, Soo Moon, Emily McKendry-Smith, Carrie Carmack, Gavin Lee, Michael Hopper, Jairus-Joaquin Matthews, Jean Cook, Donna Haley, Jill Drake

The meeting began at 2:00 PM.

- I. Approval of October 25, 2019 Minutes
 - a. The minutes were approved without revision.

- II. 3rd Tier for Lecturers
 - a. The committee discussed the distinction between a lecturer or “principal lecturer” and a “teaching professor.”
 - b. The committee discussed the effects that implementing this 3rd tier would have on faculty who are promoted into it.
 - i. Possible salary increase
 - ii. A question was asked on if this will impact seniority? Seniority is based on years of service in rank.
 - c. The committee referred to the language regarding lecturers on p.17 of the Faculty Handbook, which would be amended to implement this 3rd tier.
 - i. If someone has served for 6 years as lecturer, they can apply for promotion to senior lecturer if they have met the criteria.
 - ii. Could be amended so if someone has served for 6 years as senior lecturer, they can apply for promotion to principal lecturer if they have met the criteria.
 - iii. For every promotion, faculty must have served a certain number of years in the previous rank – issue of what that is for lecturers and number of years before someone could apply for promotion to principal lecturer.
 - d. A question was raised about the difference between principal lecturer and clinical assistant professor.
 - i. The question was raised of having a terminal degree as a possible distinction.
 - ii. “Clinical assistant professors” exist in Education and Nursing.

- iii. In Mass Communications, clinical assistant professors do not have a terminal degree but have MAs and professional experience. They are not tenure-track.
- e. The issue was raised regarding if this is the purview of the APC or the Faculty Development Committee.
 - i. Agnieszka Chwialkowska noted that we have been asked to start the discussion and then consult with Faculty Development.
 - ii. It was noted that the Faculty Development Committee may have a better understanding of what in the USG language on principal lecturers can be modified for UWG.
 - iii. It was proposed that the committee should consult with Cheryl Brown about proposing the verbiage for the Faculty Handbook.
 - iv. It was discussed that the Faculty Handbook language is often pretty general, with specifics left up to colleges and/or departments.
- f. It was discussed that the present Faculty Handbook language on senior lecturers is also vague/unclear and that how promotions are treated has changed in practice over time.
- g. A question was raised about 2.4 of the USG Principal Lecturer description, which refers to professional development for lecturers.
 - i. Emily McKendry-Smith noted that in her department, professional development for lecturers can be something like attending a conference or presenting at Innovations in Pedagogy. It is professional development that is relevant for their careers.
- h. The differences between lecturers and senior lecturers (criteria for promotion) were discussed.
 - i. Jean Cook noted that being promoted from assistant to associate professor also frequently comes with tenure.
 - ii. Emily McKendry-Smith noted that there may need to be something extra to achieve principal lecturer, rather than repeating the criteria for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer.
 - iii. Agnieszka Chwialkowska will present this discussion to Faculty Senate Exec and the Faculty Development Committee. She will specifically mention two issues:
 - 1. Use of the word “significant” in the language for promotion to principal lecturer.
 - 2. Determining if senior lecturers can go up for promotion early and if so, when?
 - a. The BOR policy allows going up for promotion after 6 years.
 - b. Early promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer is allowed after 3 years.

- c. Jill Drake noted that lecturers can go up for early promotion. Language about this will need to be added to the Faculty Handbook content on principal lecturers.
- d. Jill Drake noted that the institution must provide non-appointment notices within 3 years, but this does not mean that 3 years needs to be used in the timeline for promotions.
- e. The issue of the 7 year limit for rank as senior lecturer was raised.
- f. It was noted that in practice, how this has been implemented has changed over time. Some people have been told it was necessary to be promoted to avoid being fired
 - i. Jill Drake noted that BOR Policy Manual 8.3.8.2 notes that someone can be reappointed after 6 years if they provide exceptional teaching and extraordinary value.
- g. The question was raised of when can senior lecturers apply for promotion to principal lecturer and when could they go up early. For lecturer to senior lecturer, they can apply after 6 years and go up early after 3 years.
- h. It was reiterated that Agnieszka Chwialkowska will bring these suggestions to the Executive Committee.

III. Issue of students not majoring/minoring in the same thing

- a. Jill Drake noted that Wanda Eidson has created a rephrased policy based on feedback from chairs.
- b. The policy language regarding certificates is also being rephrased based on feedback from the APC meeting.

IV. Repeating a course to replace a grade – Policy limiting number of course attempts

- a. At Kennesaw State, students can take a course 3 times – they are allowed 2 repeats. Before taking a 3rd repeat, they must petition.
- b. At Valdosta, this policy does not apply to courses that are normally repeated for a major (such as an internship course that students might take multiple times).
- c. The issue of the impact of this policy on credit hour production was raised.
 - i. This policy will impact RPG, which is also something the university is working on.
 - ii. A question was raised about how a failing grade impacts students' financial aid. Donna Haley informed the committee that: If a student

makes an F in a course needed for the major, Financial Aid will pay until the student passes the course or they deplete their FA funds.

A student may repeat a course in which they earned a passing grade in once and financial aid will pay for both. Exception: If the course requires a certain grade, Financial Aid will pay until the student passes the course with the required grade (e.g. ENGL 1101 – must have a C or better) or they deplete their FA funds.

1. Jill Drake noted that when roster verification is done, a student either appears to be attending or non-attending. After roster verification, the credits are there.
 2. The issue of students who do not withdraw but who “disappear” from courses was discussed.
- d. Donna Haley noted that a grade of F does not count as a repeat in Banner.
- i. Jill Drake addressed this issue. She noted that if a student receives a D in a course but needs a grade of C or better, financial aid will allow them to retake it.
- e. The committee discussed how this policy is implemented at Kennesaw. When a student petitions, who does the approving?
- f. It was discussed that if this type of policy were to be implemented at UWG, the approving could be done by the college/school, the academic success center, or the advisors.
- i. It was noted that Jerome Lee, the Associate Director of Academic Support, is supportive of this.
 - ii. It was discussed that the committee should solicit additional feedback of advisors. They may be supportive of this policy, but do they feel comfortable being in charge of approving petitions?
 - iii. It was discussed that the student could meet with their advisor, the advisor would make a recommendation to the chair, and the department chair would approve the 3rd repeat/any additional repeats.
- g. The committee discussed that it is not currently possible to implement this policy in Banner.
- i. A question was raised on if APC/Senate can move on a policy without having the necessary software.
 - ii. If we are unable to identify all students repeating courses, this creates an issue of inequality.
 - iii. Jill Drake noted that HIPs are now being counted in Banner.
 1. Donna Haley noted that this is done by course.
 - iv. Michael Hopper raised the issue of if a human would be able to implement this policy.

1. It was discussed that the APC needs to consult with advisors; they may have an internal mechanism to catch students repeating courses.

V. New Business

- a. The Registrar's Office has proposed adding text to the existing policy on Repeating a Course to Replace a Grade.
 - i. The proposed text would be at the end of the policy and would read "This policy applies only to undergraduate students repeating coursework prior to graduation. If a student has graduated with a bachelor's degree, coursework repeated after graduation will not replace coursework taken prior to graduation."
 - ii. Jean Cook noted that this is similar to the issue of people wanting to return and do minors after graduating and suggested possibly having a general "graduation clause."
 - iii. Jill Drake noted that this would need to be per policy.
 - iv. Donna Haley noted that it has already been established in policy that students can't return after graduation for minors.
 - v. Jill Drake suggested tabling this until other policy revisions on repeating courses have been made.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:14 PM.