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Present:

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Carlson, Todd

Losey, Kay

Shapiro-Shapin, Carolyn

Wildey, Mikhila

Seidman College of Business

Jones-Rikkers, Catherine

College of Community and Public Service

Higbea, Raymond (Chair)

College of Education

Diarrassouba, Nagnon

Padnos College of Engineering and Computing

Corneal, Lindsay

Student Senate Representatives

A. Mueller, J. Frappi

College of Health Professions

Machnick, Kelly

Brooks College of Interdisciplinary Studies

Ripple, Darien

Kirkhof College of Nursing

Slager, Dianne (recording)

University Libraries

Beasecker, Robert

At Large—Elected by and from UAS

Provost Designee

Benet, Suzeanne

1. Welcome
2. Review and approval of minutes from November meeting

Motion to approve: L. Corneal, Second: C. Shapiro-Shapin; Motion carried.

1. Old Business

**a. Prior Learning Charge** – report to ECS

Higbea: ECS had no comments on the report. Supported by UAS vote 11/5/21 with immediate effect.

**b. Syllabi repository** – Mikhila & Kay

Wiley: Draft response shared with committee.

Discussion: How will it be submitted? Which division will be responsible (Provost or Registrar)? Discussion: S. Benet noted provost office concerns, Students representatives Frappier & A. Muller expressed students concerns about timeliness, etc. to support better informed choices for students. Shapiro-Shapin noted extraneous influences on timeliness issues (text arrival etc.) unintended consequences, Wiley noted students can refer to past syllabi for perspective, Carlson reflected on potential impact related to deadlines for student scheduling. Ripple questioned whether evidence could be gathered from LMS re access to support decisions. Losey clarified students’ timeliness issues. SOR information would not be helpful. Machnik & Slager noted that health courses have rare electives, and request that language be added indicting lack of feasibility for programs without electives. This would apply to undergraduate courses. Include caveat that syllabi are subject to change. Higbea noted that current LMS would not support this but that investigation of IT support indicates we do not have a current system to support this. Diarrassouba noted policy can precede implementation. Wildey and Losey reiterated goal for implementation to occur at university rather than unit levels.

Decision made to take the draft to various stakeholders for feedback, emphasizing that this is a request from Student Senate and that APSC wants to prevent additional work for faculty and/or department staff.

**b.1. Action Items:**

**1. Motion**: In response to the Student Senate recommending we create a syllabi

repository, we do believe posting syllabi online could be a system that is beneficial for us

students. However, to create a policy requiring that all instructors of undergraduate

courses post their syllabi online, we have some structural concerns that would need to be

addressed. As such, our recommendation is that we create a syllabi repository if and only if

the following conditions are also met:

1) The syllabi repository would be a historical repository from prior semesters. Faculty typically do not have their syllabi ready until the start of the semester. As such, this would simply be a historical record of syllabi and the repository would not be expected to have the syllabi for the current semester available. We would recommend the prior 3 years of syllabi be available.

2) The syllabi repository is a system that is maintained by a university-wide entity and not the responsibility of each college/department/unit to maintain. We believe current administrative staff do not have the time/resources to devote to such an endeavor given the amount of time it takes. For reference, for the 40 or so members of the psychology department, it takes one office staff time over the course of 2-3 weeks (roughly 8-10 hours total) to get all of the syllabi posted. We would recommend if a syllabi repository is made, that such a system is maintained by IT or Institutional Marketing, or a similar entity. One example to keep the system easier include faculty completing a form once per semester that indicates which courses they are teaching and they would upload a syllabus within the form, and then this form is directly transferred into the syllabi repository. Another example may be a system that pulls syllabi directly from those posted within the Learning Management System or Digital Measures.

3) The syllabi repository should not be publicly available. A GVSU login should be required to access the repository.

4) There may be colleges/units for which a syllabi repository may not be feasible.

**2. Motion**: L. Corneal, 2nd: T. Carlson, motion passed

**c. Rescheduling exams during exam week** – Darrian, Raymond, & Suzanne

Ripple discussed option of on-site service to provide alternative sites/times. Discussion: Many staff note that this information is commonly in syllabi, and that DSR provides services such as this when needed. Losey noted that students may need cueing to enlist faculty support for any conflicts. Frappier noted that this was an older resolution, notes student concern was of “possible” accommodation and student senate concern was that this implied some faculty might not accommodate reasonable requests. Benet noted provost office concerns promoting flexibility, while providing faculty latitude. She will discuss with P. Wells. Corneal noted that language is NOT in catalogue, and should perhaps be added there for clarity.

**c.1. Action Items**:

**1. Motion** to use this language in response to SECcharge:

“We’ve discussed with student faculty representatives and find satisfaction with current

language, but encourage wider, intentional communication of this information to

students.”

**2. Motion**: N. Diarrassouba 2nd T.Carlson, motion passed

**d. 58-credit rule** – Kelly, Kay, & Carolyn -

Losey reviewed historical perspective and google.sheet with comparisons of 2021 vs 2016. APSC findings re: minimum credit hours at 4-year institution for graduation. It appears that GVSU’s 58 credit rule is in line with most institutions.

Discussion: This charge is from Provost Cimitile. These are reasons for a change such as the need to keep up graduation rates, to support adult learners and alternative ways of earning credit, to keep up tuition $, etc. Benet: Exceptions are rarely made to the rule at GVSU because the rule is clear, and waives to the rule are rarely provided historically.

**58-credit rule**

Based on our review of the APSC research:

* 15 of the 25 institutions studied require 55 credits or more (12 of these 58 credits or more).
* 10 institutions require less than 55.
* **Three have lowered their requirement since the 2016 research by APSC**. These institutions are: Towson University, Northern Michigan University, and Oakland University.
* The majority of institutions (22) have not changed their policy since 2016.
* GVSU is in good company with universities in the 55-60 credit range. In Michigan, they are: Michigan State, Ferris State, Eastern Michigan, Western Michigan, Central Michigan, Saginaw Valley State, Wayne State, UM-Ann Arbor, and UM-Dearborn.  Out of state schools in the 55-60 credit range are: James Madison, Montclair State, Youngstown State, Western Washington, U of Nebraska-Omaha, and U of Northern Iowa.

**d.1 Action Items**:

**1. Motion**: Based on these findings, it seems reasonable to recommend the following:

* GVSU should maintain a 58-credit Senior Institution requirement.
* New programs can request exemptions for their majors.
* APSC will revisit this issue in another 5 years unless a change in the number of exemption requests suggest that the policy be revisited sooner.

**2. Motion**: Slager, 2nd Corneal, motion passed

**e. Test-optional admissions** – Carolyn, Lindsay, & Nagnon

Shapiro-Shapin reported on findings related to various disciplines, notes that math courses are significantly impacted. Bennet reiterated concerns related to timing of preliminary registration appointments and actual registration for courses. Corneal and Shapiro-Shapin noted discussion occurs at these appointments which provides some clarity. Diarrassouba expressed concern about “exceptional criteria” e.g., during the pandemic, but on further reflection, felt that this policy adequately addressed most exceptional circumstances.

**e.1 Action Items**:

**1. Motion**: We recommend that if students do not submit ACT/SAT results for admission

that they would need to do one of the following:

* provide ACT/SAT scores
* indicate that they have completed AP calculus AB or BC
* provide evidence of transfer credit for a college level math course
* Complete the GVSU math placement exam

Before they can attend their Fisrt-Year advising registration appointment. Schedules

cannot attend be accurately prepared for students without some sort of indicator about

which math class is appropriate for their first year?

**2. Motion:** Diarrassouba, 2nd Carlson, motion passed

Tabled items due to time limitations:

**f. In-person exams on election day** –proposed policy: Diarrassouba, Slager

**g. GVSU Graduate Honors Policy**—Working Group: Slager, Corneal, & Machnick

1. New Business: no new business

5. Adjourn: Move to approve: Shapiro-Shapin 2nd L.Corneal, motion passed