

Minutes of the  
Faculty Senate Academic Policy Committee (APC)  
November 20, 2012 - 3:00 pm in 206 Mann Hall

**Senators Present:** Co-chair Warren Jasper, Co-chair Dimitris Argyropoulos, Roy Borden, Jane Lubischer, Ann Penrose, Beverly Tyler, Harald Ade

**Unable to attend:** Richard Spontak, Jeannette Moore

**Guest:** Alex Yadon (Student Senate)

**1. Giving Tests On Dead Week (REG 2.20.14)**

**The issue:** Regulation 2.20.14 deals with permissible assessments due or given on Dead Week. In short, no tests or quizzes can be given on Dead Week to allow students time to prepare for their final exams. With the adoption of reading days, the number of days between the beginning of Dead Week and the beginning of finals was increased from seven to nine. However, because Thanksgiving Holiday falls right before Dead Week, in reality the number of days between the last test date and the beginning of finals is 16 days for classes that meet MW and 19 days for classes that meet on Friday. If one factors in homework/problem set and grading time, the effective end of instruction could be 26 to 30 days before any test assessment other than the final exam can be given.

Many students who take courses requiring projects have them due during Dead Week, and thus would not favor additional tests. On the other hand, students taking non project/paper courses get overloaded with tests the Monday/Tuesday before Thanksgiving, and there is usually a longer period between instruction and assessment as noted above. A compromise suggestion was to allow tests during the first two days of Dead Week (Monday and Tuesday) for classes that had no other assignments due that week such as papers and projects. This would still allow the students 7 days to prepare for final exams, while spreading out the testing days due to the Thanksgiving Holiday.

**Action Item:** Warren and Dimitris will solicit comments from their respective department heads and associate deans of academic affairs on this issue and report back to the committee. The regulation requires approval at that level, and so the committee wanted to know how they felt on this issue.

**2. Alex Yadon of the Student Senate presented Resolution 49 on the creation of a Chancellor's list.**

**The issue:** While the Dean's list recognizes academic achievement for students with a 3.25 GPA while enrolled in 15 or more credit hours per semester or a 3.5 GPA for students enrolled in 12 to 14 credit hours, the Student Senate wished to create another level of recognition for students achieving a GPA of 3.8 taking 15 or more credit hours in a semester or a GPA of 4.0 for students enrolled in 12 to 14 credit hours. Such a list would be called the Chancellor's list to differentiate it from the Dean's List.

There was discussion on the pros and cons of this idea. Currently, students with a 4.0 GPA are recognized as Valedictorians, and are assigned special recognition at graduation. In addition, there is the distinction of cum laude, magna cum laude, and summa cum laude for graduating seniors. Additional lists also just add to the pressure of grades as opposed to scholarship amongst the students. On the other hand, the students felt that those students

exhibiting exceptional achievement should be recognized, and that it might help for summer internships and fellowships.

**Action Item:** Mr. Yadon will email the committee more information about their research into a chancellor's list, which schools differentiate between student achievement, etc.

### **3. Issue of Concern:**

Harald Ade brought up the issue of grades and information on transcripts. He suggested that in addition to a final grade on the transcript, there should be a column for the average grade in the class/section as well as the average GPA of students taking that class. Such information could provide meaningful information to graduate schools and effectively normalize grade inflation. It was suggested that some numbers be run on courses with lots of students and sections to see if these two additional numbers would be beneficial.

### **4. Updates from APC members on University Standing Committees**

Jeannette Moore, Richard Spontak: **EOT (Evaluation of Teaching)**  
No Report.

Roy Borden: **UCCC (University Courses and Curricula)**  
Activities of UCCC this Fall

#### Review of Instructional formats and contact/credit hours:

Due to a question regarding problem session contact hours and credit hours and how this component was being used in courses, a subcommittee of UCCC was appointed to look into defining problem sessions and determining contact hour/credit hours. The subcommittee found that NC State had recently adopted a proposal of standard instructional formats which University Planning and Analysis will use for reporting. So, the subcommittee reviewed this proposal, which is also under review by GA, and is working on identifying the different instructional formats being used on campus. Once the instructional formats are identified and defined, the committee will establish the credit hour to contact hour ratio of these formats. This is also needed as we prepare for SACS. The subcommittee will then bring forward to full committee.

#### Syllabus Regulation revision:

In September, UCCC re-approved the syllabus guideline revisions approved in July 2012 with minor edits requested by the Associate Deans in their September meeting and to also re-insert the academic integrity statement. This is now in the hands of the Provost for his approval.

#### Course and Curricular actions:

UCCC reviewed approximately 54 actions of which 25 are new courses and reviewed 24 curricular actions including 1 new minor and 1 new certificate.

### **5. Adjourn**