

**Academic Policies and Standards Committee  
2019-2020**  
Minutes Written by Nagnon Diarrassouba  
January 16, 2020  
**Campus: Pew**  
**SCB 4002-Richard & Helen DeVos Board Room**

---

On January 16, the APSC held its monthly meeting in Seidman College of Business. The meeting was chaired by: Agnieszka Szarecka. Were present: Agnieszka Szarecka (chair), Karl Brakora, Lori Koste, Suzeanne Benet (ex officio), Robert Benseacker, Katelyn Lawman, Dianne Slager, Lindsay Corneal (ex officio) Raymond Higbea, Mikhila Wildey. The agenda had the following points:

- I. Review of the minutes from the last meeting, Dec 5, 2019.**  
*Related documents: minutes posted on BB.*
- II. Feedback from the Equity and Inclusion Division on the AF draft**  
*Related documents: complete revisions posted on BB.*
- III. Review and edits of the AF policy draft for students on probation, in jeopardy of dismissal, or dismissed** (*will be posted on BB by Jan 14*).
- IV. Review of most recent applications: pilot III.**  
*Related documents: applications posted on BB.*
- V. Continued data “mining” of pilot I-II.**
- VI.** *Related documents: completed AF pilot I-II spreadsheets (will be posted on BB by Jan 14).*

The chaired called for order and started the meeting with the first point.

- I.** Review of the minutes from the last meeting, Dec 5, 2019.  
*Related documents: minutes posted on BB.*

Because there were new members the chair asked that each member introduced themselves. After these introductions, she presented the agenda aforementioned and asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Lori motioned and Nagnon seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

- II.** Feedback from the Equity and Inclusion Division on the AF draft.  
The chair introduced that draft and asked if there were comments. There were no comments.



- III. Review and edits of the AF policy draft for students on probation, in jeopardy of dismissal, or dismissed (*will be posted on BB by Jan 14*).

The chair presented a draft, she said she would present that proposal to ECS and UAS. A discussion of the draft followed. One issue related to the two tracks. It was decided to include both voices in the draft. The chair would propose a draft and ask the APSC members to edit and return it to her.

**Rationale:** the chair read and asked members to comment on the rationale. One member, Lori Koste suggested that the rationale be in line with the students' handbook. Lori was asked to assist the chair in writing the rationale that would align with the handbook. She accepted. Suzeanne Benet proposed to delete the camp. Should we put that recovery camp will no longer occur? That section will be edited on the recovery camp given that advising already accomplished the same role. Edits were suggested and accepted.

**Target groups of Students:** Negative aspects: Lori suggested that the it be recognized that the AF has some biases. She said that it may not be accepted by external parties. Suzeannes said that there were concerns with unrepresented populations and the financial aspect of the AF. Some concerns were raised in relation to students of color, the number of students dismissed. The chair explained that the academic deans and various offices have informed and involved in the discussion about the academic forgiveness policy. It was recommended that the chair put in her report the offices and the college deans that participated in the discussion of that policy. For the external recognition parties' recognition, it was decided that the general reputation of the university was not a problem in that at the graduate level such a policy existed.

**Eligibility for the program:** point 4 was amended as follows: "Students must demonstrate that they pursue a different major through an academic major than the one they originally chose.

**Definitions:** no comment or suggestion of edits.

**Terms of academic forgiveness.** All terms were reviewed. The chair expressed the opinion of the registrar's office concern about the C- grade. The chair asked if there was still agreement on the C- and asked for a motion to approve that grade. Karl motioned to keep the C- and Nagnon seconded his motion. There was one opposition to that point. It was then adopted. Point 11. Application process point 6. Do we specify the process which includes Academic Review committee? Should it even be included? It was decided that it should be included in the catalogue. Should review process be included, no deadline. It should be a talking point. Appeals are also a talking point. The chair sought any comments or addition of elements that are not included in this draft. Eligibility, appeals process, areas would be part of the final draft. The chair asked to share things that stood out from the review of applications and student forgiven. The members shared ideas about their the outcomes of previous forgiven students  
A new batch of applications would be sent out to each member on a spread sheet.

- IV. **Review and edits of the AF policy draft for students on probation, in jeopardy of dismissal, or dismissed** (*will be posted on BB by Jan 14*).

Related documents: applications posted on BB.



Interesting case from a student who shifted from CJ to computer science. The student graduated in CJ and was coming back to want to get a computer science. The case was discussed. Would accepting that application negate the degree that they obtained? One suggested that you can't abandon a completed major. Should we include exclusion and inclusion criteria in the policy? Discussion needs to continue internally on that point. Any policy needs to be reviewed as it is applied. Raymond said that any policy is never done for good. It needs to be revisited at some points.

Another student dropped from Honors college and wanted to be forgiven grades. Application was rejected.

One application was to be reconsidered with Karl expertise. That case related to introduction to engineering. A course was deemed not eligible for the AF and for the major. The student was eligible academic; the advisor will be contacted for student resubmit application.

Applications approved, one was rejected. The rejected application was that of but the only Mohamed S. whose application was rejected but situation was changed and he resubmitted an application and became eligible. The chair still felt that application posed problems. He was dismissed in summer 2019 and was coming back. He met eligibility criteria. One or two applications were in the pipeline.

Academic Forgiveness: should criteria be more stringent? C-, a minimum of two courses. Should we keep these? To discuss these issues and look at combined data a date of January 30<sup>th</sup> was suggested for a meeting, 9-11AM. The work should be accomplished before Friday January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2020.

V. Continued data "mining" of pilot I-II.

Spread sheets have been completed. Chair sought to have comments on the data in the spread sheets. What should we target in the presentation to ECS? Current standing of applicants who was taking advantage of the program, who was leaving, who was coming, what they transferred from and where they transferred to, are they enrolled should be information to include in the report. Matrixes would be very useful. Recovery camps categorize by semester. Put in table GPA pre-forgiveness, GPA at forgiveness, GPA post forgiveness, major left, and major entered should be part of the report. Multiple tables will be needed to display data to be presented. Suzanne Benet would send faculty to assist with that work. Does ECS need that detailed report? Report will include data.

Information will be sent out for the next meeting is on February 13.

VI. Related documents: completed AF pilot I-II spreadsheets (will be posted on BB by Jan 14).

Members will review the spreadsheets and complete them with new information related to students that they were in charged of.

The meeting was dismissed at 10:56 AM.

**Next meeting: February 13, SCB 4002**