Academic Policies Committee Report
2024-2025

Committee chair: Douglas Eyman
Committee members: Kerri LaCharite, Alexandra Masterson, Cristiana Stan, Debra Stroiney

Academic Policies Revised/Updated and Approved by Faculty Senate:
- AP 1.3.4 Repeating a Course. Separated graduate- and undergraduate-specific polices. (approved 4/2)
- AP 1.4.4 Graduate Course Enrollments by Undergraduates. Clarified processes and relationship to BAM programs. (approved 4/2)
- AP 1.4.6 Enrolling for Credit Without Grade Points. Removed confusing language about S/NS grades for 999/998 courses. (approved 4/2)
- AP 2.5 Course Syllabi. Added AI statement as a syllabus requirement. (approved 4/2)

Academic Policies reviewed and updated with nonsubstantive changes (not requiring a vote):
- AP 1.7 Re-enrollment After Previous Attendance.

Other activity:
- Revised committee charge to clarify scope and relationship to other related committees (Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, Policy Management Group).
- Provided responses to Grading Process Task Force draft report.
- Committee chair Eyman served as a voting member on the Graduate Council and ex oficio member of the Policy Management Group.
- Committee member Masterson served as the AP representative to the Grading Task Force.
- The committee reviewed the 2027-28 Academic Calendar.

Questions from the Executive Committee

During the past calendar year has the President, Provost, or Senior Vice President (or their respective offices) announced initiatives or goals or acted upon issues that fall under the charge of your Committee? If so, was your Committee consulted by the President, Provost, or Senior Vice President in a timely manner before the announcement or action? If not, do you believe your Committee should have been consulted? Would it have been helpful to have had the input of your Committee from the outset?

The AI Task Force originally planned to develop AI related policy for several different stakeholders, including faculty and students. They ultimately decided to create guidance (rather than policy), in effect side-stepping the policy approval process, but then tied that guidance to currently existing policies. AP did have representation on the Task Force as the AP chair served on the Core Principles working group and the student-facing guidance working group.

Did your Committee seek information or input from the President, Provost, or Senior Vice President or members of their staffs?   If so, did they respond adequately and in a timely manner?

Our committee had occasion to communicate with the registrar's office, and we also worked closely

with the Provost's office when working with the Graduate Division/Graduate Council and the Policy Management Group. We have a good working relationship with the Associate Provosts who chair those committees.

Please suggest how you believe the President, Provost, Senior Vice President and/or their staffs might more effectively interact with your Committee in the future, if necessary.

Updates to policies that are clearly academic (and now listed in the updated AP charge) should trigger a conversation with our committee. For instance, past work on Academic Standards took place without any input from AP despite clearly being academic policy.

Please relate any additional information you may have regarding interactions between your Committee and the President, Provost, Senior Vice President, or their staff.

N/A