ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
Monday, October 24, 2022
2:30p.m. | UC Council Room
MINUTES

Present: Allen, Benedict, Cieminski, Couch, Leonard, Levin, Mahovsky, Muller, Senbet, Welsh

Absent: Jensen, Parker, Wieben

Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 2:33

Approval of the Agenda
Approved without objection

Approval of the October 10, 2022 meeting minutes
Approved without objection

Announcements/Chair's Report
Levin: Early feedback about the 4-day class schedule is coming in. Most are in favor of having Friday be the non-teaching day.
Matchett: The Provost made it clear that she will make a decision on the existing proposal, but not on a Fridays off proposal. A no-teaching on Fridays proposal would be a new proposal.
Senbet: Faculty senate can deliberate about the range of associated issues and make a recommendation to reflect faculty preference however we see fit. Our role as faculty is to contribute to conversation.

Reports from Councils:
Graduate Council – Reworking the 799 dissertation credit range policy, and will bring updates soon.
    We're discussing the GC's role in program review and other roles
Liberal Arts Council – Working on courses in the workflow as they arrive
Professional Education Council – Discussing House Bill 22-1220 and its implications
Undergraduate Council – Revising the S/U grading policy proposal
Student Senate – No report

- Retroactive Degree Conferral (back from codification)

DISCUSSION: Minor edits suggested.

MOTION: Accept the revisions and send the policy to Faculty Senate. Approved by unanimous voice vote.

- 4-day class schedule – on hold awaiting faculty feedback

New Business

- Course Late Add – Recommended Policy Language Update

DISCUSSION: Does this match other definitions of course participation? Yes, it's aligned with other state and UNC definitions. Edits suggested to remove the word "attendance" and focus only on "academic engagement" with a link to that definition.

MOTION: Accept the edited policy and send the policy to Codification. Approved by unanimous voice vote.

- Program Review proposal

DISCUSSION: The Provost's office has finished this report with recommendations about Program Review

 What is APC's responsibility with respect to this report. What are our goals relevant to it?

 Report feedback:

  Section 1 – Annual review – If this is adopted, we request to add a requirement that the Dean provides feedback to the program about the outcome of the Dean's review.

  What are programs compared to? National trends? Budget allocations?

  Minor corrections and edits were suggested.

  Should we add more specificity to the program sunsetting recommendations? That can be very challenging because context matters.

 If program sunsetting is the main concern, we need a document or process that ensures the process is overseen or reviewed by some university committee

 Throughout, the document needs to be more consistent about what is the unit of review. Is it the program or the unit?

 What are the critical follow-up suggestions or actions? Should we get more feedback from (or have a conversation with) the provost?

TO DO: Review the proposal and generate feedback for the provost.

Comments to the Good of the Ordov2it[atC /Artifact B[at12 50.8v 2/TT73 500.510.ref(t[atETBT/P AMC74 8 BDC 12