

ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE

Monday, February 16, 2026
2:30 p.m. | UC Council Room

Present: Chapin, Cieminski, Garrett, Gershwin, Han, Leonard, Karlin
Zoom: Borum, Clavir, Ethridge-Woodson, Heiny, Leatherman, Mannello, Paytoe Gbayee,
Roberts, Trask, Wood
Absent:

Call to Order 2:32

Approval of the Agenda approved without objection

Approval of the February 2, 2026, meeting minutes approved without objection

Announcements/Chair's Report:

- Proposal to Adjust Full-Time and Part-Time Enrollment in Graduate Programs approved
- Division of Student Academic Success, Undergraduate Academic Standing Language proposal sent to Senate for 2/16/26
- AI Syllabus proposal sent to Senate for 3/2/26

Reports from Councils:

Graduate Council (Cieminski) – Graduate Council will meet soon. In October, the Council approved a motion to increase the accelerated master's credits. The current number of credits allows undergraduates to take 9 credits of 500-level coursework, the Council approved an increase to 12 credits at that time but ultimately did not move forward.

Liberal Arts Council (Wood) – No report

Professional Education Council (Paytoe Gbayee) - Paytoe Gbayee attended a workflow meeting with Ethridge-Woodson, Gershwin, representatives from the Registrar's Office, and others involved in the curriculum process at various stages. From PEC's perspective, they felt seen and heard, appreciated being included in the discussion, and look forward to continuing to be part of the conversation moving forward.

Undergraduate Council (Karlin) – The Council met last week and is continuing work on the Work-to-Learn document. This will be a lengthy process; two sections have been completed in the initial review phase.

Student Government Association (Baxter) – No report

Special Reports:

Special Order:

New Business:

1. Graduate School Request: Policy around school credits for accelerated graduate programs (Cieminski) [12 Credits for 4 + 1 Accelerated Masters.docx](#)
 - Cieminski explained that once a program is approved, they follow rules that provide guidance and ensure the rigor and integrity of the class aligned with the master's degree that is in place.
 - Individual programs will return to their units to determine what is permitted and who will be responsible for making the necessary changes.
 - Garrett noted that the proposal makes sense, particularly if other institutions are already implementing similar practices.
 - Gershwin asked why the number was set at 12 credits.
 - It was explained that 12 credits appear to be the most sufficient and appropriate amount.
 - It was questioned whether there was enough flexibility in an undergraduate program if the number were set at 15 credits.
 - It was clarified that 12 credits align with what most Colorado institutions are currently doing.
 - **MOTION:** Garrett moves to approve the proposal, seconded by Chapin.
 - **DISCUSSION:**
 - The change will be reflected in the catalog, and programs with accelerated pathways will be responsible for implementing the necessary revisions.
 - Ethridge-Woodson noted that a typical master's degree requires 30–34 credit hours, 12 credits represent approximately 30–35%, which would be a substantial savings for students.
 - **VOTE:** The motion was approved unanimously.

Continued Business:

1. **S/U Grading Policy Proposed Modifications.**
 - See [S U Grading Option Senate Proposal.docx](#)
 - Cieminski stated that the sentence “S will be applied when the instructor assigns a grade of C- or higher” and the comment stating that a grade of S satisfies prerequisites that require a C or higher, contradict each other and requires further clarification.
 - Heiny clarified that currently, an S grade is a C- or higher. With an S grade, units cannot determine the actual letter grade earned and a D- cannot be accepted without a program-approved exception.
 - She considers a C- sufficient and changing the minimum to a C would require the Registrar to make changes to the entire policy.
 - For transfer courses with a C-, the language would align with the existing transfer policy.
 - It was suggested that removing the language stating “S meets all grade-based requirements...” may help clarify the policy for the Registrar's Office.
 - Clavir noted that if no S grades are allowed, several programs that currently accept S as a valid grade would be affected.

- Gershwin asked whether the Registrar could provide some language to help resolve the issue.
 - Clavir confirmed they could help to find a solution
- Etheridge-Woodson asked how many degree programs require a B or better. If the number is minimal, could an exception be carved out only for those programs?
 - Clavir shared that the following programs require a C or higher and will not accept an S: ASLEI, Chemistry, Criminology and Criminal Justice, Dietetics, Nursing, and Physics.
 - Policy language has generally been discouraged from being overly specific.
- Garrett emphasized the need to consider the populations students will serve after graduation.
- Leatherman suggested reverting to current language.
- Suggested Edits:
 - Remove “Courses completed with the S/U grading option cannot be applied to a new or future major, minor, or certificate program, unless an exception is made by a program. Some programs may require a minimum letter grade in specific courses, and this level of achievement cannot be verified from an S/U grade. “
 - Remove Strikethrough from, “If a student changes or adds a major, minor, or certificate program that requires a course they had previously selected as S/U, an S satisfies any minimum grade requirement. An S- satisfies grade requirements of D-, D, or D.”
 - Then insert, “An S/U course grade cannot be applied to a new or a future major in which higher than a C is required. Departments may grant an exception, on a case-by-case basis.”
 - Remove. “Courses that may later apply to a major, minor, or certificate should not be taken for the S/U grading option, as these grades cannot be transferred or applied to fulfill program requirements.”
 - Remove, “S/U grades cannot later be applied or transferred into a declared major, minor, or certificate program. Students who anticipate changing or adding academic programs should contact their college academic advisor, academic success coordinator, or faculty advisor.”

2. Policy Recommendations of the Artificial Intelligence (AI) Task Force

- See AI APC Policy folder for all related documents: [AI Policies](#)
- APC Responsibilities:
 - (a) [AI syllabus policy](#) sent to senate for motion (2/12/26)
 - (b) APC Completed the following (2/2/26):
 - Reviewed Undergrad/Graduate catalogs re: Student Code of Conduct/plagiarism policy to ensure it is aligned with AI policy and AI taskforce recommendations.
 - Reviewed Student Code of Conduct: [UNCO Student-Code-of-Conduct.pdf](#)
 - Reviewed UNCO Graduate Catalog Plagiarism- AI Policy for AI additions/edits: [GRADUATE CATALOG 2025-2026: Plagiarism - Generative Artificial Intelligence Policy](#)
 - APC Reviewed UNCO Plagiarism- Student Policies and Procedures for AI additions/edits: [UNCO Plagiarism- Student Policies and Procedures.docx](#)

Goal: Complete all AI work (syllabi statement and university policy reviews) by March 2026 (completed 2/2/26)

2. Academic Appeals Board requests:
 - Revise the Academic Appeal Procedure in Board Policy Manual 2-1-201
 - Revise the Academic Appeal committee membership in Board Policy Manual 2-1-201
 - Endres presented to APC 1/20/26
 - See (Draft) [Revised Academic Appeal Procedure.docx](#)

3. Request: Revise Academic Standing Language from “*Academic Probation*” to “*Academic Standing Warning*”
 - APC Motioned and approved to change “*Academic Probation*” to “*Academic Warning.*” On 10/7/25
 - APC Sent tracked/suggested changes to Codification 10/7/25
 - Codification reviewed and suggested changes to the academic standing language. See [Academic Standing Change-COD 10-8-25.docx](#)
 - APC sent the proposal (2/12/26) to Lee for the 3/2/26 Senate meeting.

Comments to the Good of the Order
Adjournment 3:45pm

Tracy Gershwin
Chair