**Academic Policy Council**

**February 17, 2017**

**Mahar 467**

**Minutes**

Present: Eve Clark, Chair   
 Jason Zenor   
 Sue Fettes

Jean Chambers

Pat Russo

Mary McCune

Rameen Mohammadi  
 Michelle Bishop

Meeting commenced at 3:11 p.m.

1. **Approval of the agenda**Fettes moved to approve, Chambers seconded. Approved unanimously
2. **Approval of the February 3, 2017 minutes**

Chambers moved to approve with minor changes, Fettes seconded. Approved.

1. **Chair’s Report**  
   Clark felt that communication between Councils appears wanting. She used the approval of Writing Plans as an example. She didn’t know if APC can do anything about this but it seems like things hit the floor of Faculty Assembly without clarity regarding whether all elements have been dealt with. She felt APC is last line of defense. Chambers wondered if FAEB could deal with this. Fettes and Mohammadi pointed out that there is a place where one can find whether matters have passed through the various Councils. Mohammadi will share with Clark. Cathy Johnston is responsible for updating the spreadsheet.

Clark reminded Council members about the COACHE survey. This organization is doing a report comparing faculty sentiment on a number of issues with other institutions, both public and private.

Fettes asked Mohammadi about the language from Disability Student Services regarding “sensitivity to absences.” She inquired whether there were a place for faculty to find out the definition of such phrases and wondered if this issue should be raised with the Student Concerns Committee. Discussion ensued regarding the situation that gave rise to the phrase: a faculty member was not being sensitive to a student’s need for the absences. Faculty is not allowed to ask why a student is being accommodated through Disability Student Services. Could perhaps talk about the implications to the student’s grade, though, if too many classes are missed. Discussion then turned to the issue of emotional support animals and whether a student needs to provide documentation for the accommodation. If the animal is disruptive to class, faculty should definitely contact Disability Student Services.

1. **Old Business:**
2. **Geology BS Track I and II**

Clark wanted to go over the proposal one more time based on Bishop’s recent emailed comments. The major issue was the credit numbers in Track II Core in the “Select one course from the following four.” Three of these courses can be taken for 2 or 3 credits. Need to change total in the Core to 26-27 credits.

Fettes stated that the way they have it written they are requiring students take these courses for three credits. Change the language to read: “Select one course from the following four (3 cr.)” Then the total in the Core will be 26 credits.

For greater clarity should model that in each section that has “select” language.

Clark read Jean Dufore’s email indicating that UCC has approved GEO 350. APC had asked GEO to remove the course from Track II. Now it can go back into the electives.

Fettes doublechecked the number of overall and credits and confirmed that it is correct.

Fettes asked if APC checked for hidden prerequisites. Clark felt that, given the Core requirements, a student could not get caught up by hidden prerequisites. Fettes looked over the Core and agreed.

Agreed that all the formatting changes regarding “select” language should be made in Track I as well.

Bishop found a couple of courses with title problems. GEO 325: Geographic Information Systems is listed on-line as Geology of the Bahamas. If Valentino can show Clark that UCC has approved change, proposal can go to the floor.

Bishop pointed out that PHY 111 needs to read PHY 111 College Physics I, not simply College Physics.

Fettes stated that Track I Elective language should be changed to read “Select three 300 or 400 level GEO or GCH courses excluding GEO 305, GEO 306 and GEO 315.”

Chambers motioned to approve with changes. Fettes seconded. Approved unanimously.

1. [**Motion to reduce minimum number of credits to graduate to 120**](https://www.oswego.edu/faculty-assembly/sites/www.oswego.edu.faculty-assembly/files/120_cr_motion_to_fa_floor.pdf)

Fettes stated that APC Minutes indicated that Council asked for a plan for implementation which it did not receive. Clark stated that she did not ask Glidden for implementation plan because Faculty Assembly did not require it. Mohammadi provided the history behind the motion. He felt that implementation would be much smoother if only applied to 2017-2018 and on. If the proposal is implemented retroactively, the process would be much more complicated. Clark noted that current students could opt for the lower credit load, if they wanted to. Mohammadi noted there would be no implementation plan needed if the motion was stated in that manner. Zenor wondered about any problems with a student going over 120 credits. Mohammadi stated this was solely about reaching a minimum.

Clark stated that the motion should be changed to read: Reduce minimum number of credits required for graduation at SUNY Oswego to 120 for students under the 2017-2018 and later catalogs.” Discussion of procedure and fact that Faculty Assembly could vote against the motion.

Zenor wondered if any departments had created 2-credit courses and would these then be impacted. No departments have created such courses.

Chambers moved to send the motion back to Glidden to amend and put to the floor of Faculty Assembly. Russo seconded. Approved unanimously.

1. **New Business**
2. **Report Out Items: ECE Curriculum Modification, BRC core course change**

Clark discussed reviewing report-out procedures and proposed then bringing them to Faculty Assembly to remind Assembly of what report-out items are.

Fettes brought up the fact that program deactivation is informational only and cannot be acted on by Faculty Assembly. There have been lots of requests from departments for clarification. APC will review procedure and share with faculty.

Discussion of potentially murky issues. Memos, for example, are easier and can avoid a lot of process. Electrical and Computer Engineering is an example. Zenor also brought up an issue with BRC.

Discussion of the ECE proposal regarding whether this requires a major change or simply a modification. Fettes felt this change is similar to the footnote used in the Business major. Fettes felt in ECE case likewise needs language indicating “if student has taken this, then student does not need to take that”. Clark asked whether the footnote had to go through full system or whether it would be equivalent to changing an elective list. Fettes thought the issue was murky and depended on how written. Referred again to the language “If student has already have taken these course, then the student does not have to take this other course.” The proposal presented by ECE is different. Clark will go back to ECE and urge them to move forward with a footnote, letting them know that to do otherwise would mean going through the whole process.

Chambers wondered how DegreeWorks handles footnotes. Mohammadi indicated that the change is programmed in.

Fettes proposed the following language for the footnote: “Students in the major who complete MAT 215 and MAT 318 with a C- or better fulfill the 339 requirement.”

Mohammadi thought Clark should talk to Manseur about the potential consequences of the side-by-side approach versus the footnote.

Clark returned to the discussion of clarifying what Faculty Assembly can vote on, what Faculty Assembly can vote on if they choose to, and what Faculty Assembly cannot vote on.

Clark will go back to Manseur, report Council’s recommendation and see where ECE wants to go from there.

**BRC:** Zenor brought up another issue. BRC is doing a redesign and the program change is moving up ladder. They also want to change BRC 321 to “any BRC 300 or higher” and were told that this change would need to go to SUNY. Mohammadi doesn’t think that this has to go to SUNY. Dean’s office wants them to wait on this change until program redesign is completed.

Clark concluded that report-out procedure is clearer now and Russo concurred adding that fuzzy areas will arise in the future

1. **Updates to college withdrawal, medical leave, and military leave policies.**

Mohammadi described the background for these changes which aim to streamline the process and to make it easier for the student while also ensuring that the students receives input and assistance. The administration wants it to be easier for the student but also to ensure that students understand the implications of their decisions. Student Affairs wants to move the process from the Compass to the Dean of Students. Focused on the Medical Leave changes: have been facing for a number of years students who experience mental health issues close to the end of the semester and thus withdraw. In that case the student could come back without having to prove that they were addressing the issue or under medical or psychiatric care. Some medication take a long to calibrate. There was a concern that with no evidence required to re-enter that the students weren’t receiving the support they needed and that the institution could not stop them from reentering before they were ready.

Zenor raised the fact that the withdrawal language indicates that can do this quickly and the student will be contacted. The medical leave language has no time frame indicated. Mohammadi replied that the medical leave language will follow the information on the college withdrawal process. Trying to avoid repetition and the risk of leaving something out. Russo suggested moving “Process for Requesting Medical Leave” up to above the paragraph beginning with “Upon….”

Fettes felt the language seemed disjointed. Mohammadi requested that Council members send him their thoughts via email and he will bring back to the committee that drafted the language. Council will vote on revised language at its next meeting.

Discussion of likely agenda for the March 3rd meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary McCune