

## ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE

Monday, September 15, 2025  
2:30p.m. | Campus Commons 2300

Present: Chapin, Couch, Garrett, Gershwin, Heiny, Han, Karlin, Leatherman, Leonard, Mannello, Newman, Paytoe Gbayee, Trask  
Zoom: Cieminski, Etheridge-Woodson, Muller  
Absent:

### Call to Order 2:32pm

Approval of the Agenda approved without objection

Approval of the September 2, 2025, meeting minutes approved without objection

Announcements/Chair's Report (Gershwin) – no report. Gershwin is still waiting for a response from the Academic Appeals Board regarding membership.

### Reports from Councils

Graduate Council (Cieminski) – Graduate Council will have their first meeting on Thursday.

Liberal Arts Council (Muller) – The LAC has not met since last APC meeting. We will be meeting on Tuesday the 16th and will focus on a variety of registrar-related issues.

Muller, Bebee, are working on scheduling Direct Assessment Follow-Up Meetings with units whose team courses in the writing category. Included in relevant meetings there will be further discussion of the CO2-CO3 required course changes.

Professional Education Council (Paytoe Gbayee) – No report

Undergraduate Council (Karlin) – Mikay Elliot will bring a proposal about catalog changes regarding “academic probation.”

Student Government Association (Baxter) – No report

### Special Reports

### Special Order

### Old Business

#### **1. Micro-credential Committee: ([folder with documents](#))**

- Discussion of Micro-credential recommendations, per [MRC Addendum document](#)-  
Unanswered Questions:
  - Will this committee have administrative support, such as the Faculty Senate Committees do with Lee Amor?
  - Who will be in charge of/make updates to the website?
  - Which platform will we use?
    - Canvas would be the platform.
  - How do we pay for the platform and other possible costs?
    - This will need to be discussed further
- Approve [Strategic and Operational Framework](#) and [MRC Committee Charge](#)

- Next steps: Board Manual, All faculty meeting vote for micro-credential committee (Qualtrics through All faculty)
- The committee discussed the potential structure, membership, and oversight of a new university-wide body, possibly modeled after the LAC.
  - A University Libraries seat will need to be added
- There were members that thought that the application process was too detailed, while others believed the level of details was appropriate.
- Members agree that this committee will be a university-wide committee.
  - How do we go about creating these committees?
  - Board Policy language will need to be drafted.
- Muller stated that support for this committee will need to be determined.
  - Who will run the website?
  - Will curriculum be involved?
- Leatherman was concerned that if this committee is university-wide, it will take away from the bigger things happening at the program level.
  - The MRC is being considered as a university wide committee because micro credentials could be credit-bearing or not.
- Since these will eventually end up in the curriculum workflow, it was suggested to have a parallel workflow system.
- Muller asked who would be responsible for the committee once approved by Senate?
  - It was noted that the new language will be sent to Faculty Senate for review and to finalize the committee's charge.
- The committee considered whether the chair should come from the Registrar's Office.
  - Consensus was that the Registrar's role should be to facilitate and serve as an ex officio member, rather than chair.
  - The chair should be selected from the voting faculty.
- It was noted that a member of the COM would have to be included eventually.
- Members suggested comparing the proposed framework to other standing committees for consistency.
- The committee may need to step back and review the broader framework, especially if most activities will be credit-bearing or purely professional in nature.
- Gershwin will draft language aligning with university committee standards and bring it back to APC for review.
  - Elections for the committee will be run through Faculty Senate, with the committee reporting back to APC.
- It was recommended to bring a list of questions to Senate for clarification and continue working on this at the same time.
  - Gershwin, Newman, and Etheridge-Woodson will continue discussions and refine recommendations for further review.

**2. Review and Discuss the Division of Student Academic Success Proposal:**

Request: Revise Academic Standing Language from “*Academic Probation*” to “*Academic Standing Warning*”

Sponsor: Mikay Elliott, Academic and Advising Success Strategist and Academic Review Coordinator, Division of Student Academic Success  
APC Submission Date: September 09, 2025

**Proposal Summary:** Advocating on behalf of the desire of students and the professional academic advisor network to meet the desire among the academic advising community to make an effort to rename “*Academic Probation*” to a more student-friendly and accessible program name. After research, professional development, open discussion, and solicited student feedback, we have landed on “**Academic Standing Warning**” as an alternative. This will also put the policy in harmony with the graduate catalog policy.

- At the last UGC meeting, Elliot explained that the proposal aims to replace the term “probation” with alternative language to avoid its negative connotation.
  - Based on the research she has done other institutions have already moved away from using that term.
- There were concerns about whether students would pay attention to the less urgent-sounding warning.
  - Newman suggested “Academic Standing Alert”
- Heiny shared that based on how things are set up in the registrar’s office, the language will have to be further discussed.
  - She mentioned that the language in the undergraduate and graduate catalogs differ, and the coding structure and communication would have to be changed.
- Leonard questioned whether additional clarifying language would be needed, as replacing a word may not fully convey the intended meaning
- Since research and surveys have been done regarding this proposal it was suggested that the Mikay and Staphanie still attend the next meeting to share more information and answer any questions the committee may have.

### 3. S/U Grading Policy

- a. Add note from Registrar: *(Note: The S/U grading policy supersedes program level grade requirements where pre-requisites are above a letter grade of "C-".)*
  - b. Add note for Nursing: From Nursing: S/U grades may have an impact on eligibility for graduate school, or *professional school or licensure programs such as nursing.* Students should...
- Couch shared that there are programs that have policies that conflict with the S/U Policy.
    - He is requesting caveat language (see highlighted) to guide the registrar’s office when a university-wide policy conflicts with a program-level policy.
  - Leonard shared that ultimately it was up to the professor to determine grades, and the university uses two different grading systems, which should be clarified.
  - Paytoe Gbayee stayed that university-wide policies should supersede program policies.

- Garrett is concerned that students may spend money on courses and not be able to continue if they don't pass.
    - Faculty should provide the students with some guidance in these cases.
  - Newman asked if programs have the say in which courses can and cannot have an S/U grade?
    - This is where Couch and his office want to determine, since his staff will face these concerns at the end of the semester.
  - LAC courses or courses outside a student's current major would be affected and problems arise when a student switches majors and a course previously taken S/U becomes a required/critical course in the new major.
  - Han stated that if students switch majors and they have already taken a critical course in that major but did not meet the requirements, they should retake the course.
    - This could then create a financial issue.
    - If financial aid is impacted, requiring students to retake courses they have already passed is not "student-first."
  - This discussion will continue at the next meeting
- 4. Academic Appeals Board:** Policy requires revisions.
- Checking in with board chair.

Unfinished Business on hold

- 1. Integration of the new med school faculty:** Faculty Senate membership
  - a. Still need more information for a charge related to medical school faculty senate membership (faculty welfare or APC?)
- 2. Curriculum Standards Recommendations** ([folder with documents](#))
  - a. Certificate description and residency requirements
  - b. Need to draft Certificate description and residency requirements
  - c. Need to build/review catalog template and review the concentrations
- 3. Amorous Relations Policy** ([folder with documents](#))
  - a. [Amorous Policy](#)
  - b. Next Steps → Approved by Cabinet, Submitted to Faculty Welfare.
- 4. Graduate Student Full-time vs. Part-time Status**

Comments to the Good of the Order  
Adjournment 3:49pm

Tracy Gershwin  
 Chair