

Academic Policies Committee	
Minutes	
Thursday, October 1, 2015	
Metro Room, Ellison Campus Center	
Meeting: APC 2015/2016:02	
Convened	3:19 p.m.
Attending	Joseph Cambone, Elizabeth Duclos-Orsello (Vice-Chair), Hannah Fraley, Hongtao Guo, Mindy Jeon, Chad Leith, Pamela Leong, Linda Nowak, Ken Reker, Donna Seger, Steven Silvern, Daniel Veira, and Peter Walker (Chair).
Guest(s)	<p>Megan Miller (Registrar)</p> <p>R. Clarke Fowler (Childhood Education and Care)</p> <p>Rebecca Comage (Diversity and Multicultural Affairs)</p> <p>Sara Dietrich (Center for International Education/LGBTQ Task Force)</p> <p>Julia Golden (Diversity and Multicultural Affairs/LGBTQ Liaison)</p> <p>Michael Mobley (Psychology)</p> <p>Dan Walinsky (Psychology/LGBTQ Task Force)</p> <p>C. Julie Whitlow (English/LGBTQ Task Force)</p> <p>Daniel Williams (Registrar's Office/LGBTQ Task Force)</p> <p>James Burgers (Student/Alliance)</p> <p>Colin Buckley (Student/Alliance)</p> <p>Gabrielle Falcone (Student/Alliance)</p> <p>Catherine Dickenson (Student/Alliance)</p> <p>Brooke Geronin (Student/Alliance)</p> <p>Bethany Haselgard (Student/Alliance)</p> <p>Julie Herman (Student/Alliance)</p> <p>Mason Keeley (Student/Alliance)</p> <p>Shanee Lebaron (Graduate Assistant/Diversity and Multicultural Affairs)</p> <p>Koda Mehalba (Student/Alliance)</p> <p>Kris Nolans (Resident Director/Alliance Advisor)</p> <p>Curtis Penniman (Student/Alliance)</p> <p>Kaitlin Pope (Student/Alliance)</p> <p>Dominique Resendes (Student/Alliance)</p> <p>Daniel Roberts (Student/Alliance)</p> <p>Madison Roberts (Student/Alliance)</p> <p>Allison Walker (Student/Alliance)</p> <p>Stella Willis (Student/Alliance)</p> <p>Elicia Zecchini (Student/Alliance)</p>
Documents (attached)	
I.	<p>Approval of Minutes</p> <p>The approval of the minutes of September 2, 2015 was conducted over email.</p>

	<p>Motion to approve the minutes of September 2, 2015 Made by: L. Nowak Seconded: J. Cambone</p> <p>In favor (8). Against (0). Abstentions (5). Motion passed.</p>
II.	<p>Introduction of Members</p> <p>E. Duclos-Orsello (Vice-Chair) convened the meeting, as Chair P. Walker's class schedule conflicts with the fall APC meetings.</p>
III.	<p>Chair's Report</p> <p>A. Welcome</p>
IV.	<p>Standing Subcommittees: Request for Volunteers</p> <p>A. Additional Recorders</p> <p>S. Edwards, B. Galinski, P. Leong, and D. Veira will rotate as recorders.</p> <p>B. Selective Retention</p> <p>M. Miller (Registrar) summarized the functions of the Selective Retention Committee: This committee meets three times a year to consider student appeals of academic dismissals. The selective retention committee meetings are held in January, late May/early June, and August. The committee reviews academic dismissal appeals and comes to a consensus about whether to deny or re-admit students. The committee may request or recommend that students re-evaluate their academic goals and pathways.</p> <p>J. Cambone, S. Edwards, B. Galinski, H. Fraley, and P. Leong volunteered to serve on the Selective Retention Committee.</p> <p>C. Academic Calendar</p> <p>The Academic Calendar Subcommittee sets up a structured calendar, usually two years out, that includes the dates of when classes begin, when we have exams, and all of the other particular academic dates.</p> <p>Recurring issues have arisen with respect to the academic calendar.</p> <p>M. Miller (Registrar) brought to the committee's attention the existence of a policy that was approved by the Academic Policies Committee. This policy governs the number of days in the term that certain activities occur. M. Miller recommended that the Academic Policies Committee search for the policy and circulate it among all committee members. M. Miller further recommended that the Academic Policies Committee re-examine and revise that policy.</p>

	<p>Student member D. Veira suggested that it might be helpful to have a student member on the Academic Calendar Subcommittee, as students also are directly affected by the academic schedule. He asked whether the Student Government Association (SGA) members might serve on the Academic Calendar Subcommittee, or whether SGA members concurrently needed to be a member of the Academic Policies Committee. Vice-Chair E. Duclos-Orsello indicated that the formal committee (Academic Policies) would have to invite members outside of APC to serve on the subcommittee.</p> <p>D. Seger, Bonnie Galinski, H. Guo, M. Jeon, and D. Veira volunteered to serve on the Academic Calendar Subcommittee.</p>
<p>V.</p> <p>Motion:</p>	<p>New Business</p> <p>A. Requirements for Entry into the Early Education and Care Methods Courses (16:034)</p> <p>Motion to approve Proposal 16:034 Made by: K. Reker Seconded: D. Seger</p> <p><u>OVERVIEW:</u></p> <p>R. Clarke Fowler, Chair of the Childhood Education and Care, provided an overview and rationale of the proposal. The School of Education has undergone many changes. With the combined bachelor’s and master’s 4+1 programs, the School of Education needed to make additional changes. The plan was to set up lots of benchmarks that students had to meet before they could enter the early education and care methods courses. This included having minimum G.P.A. requirements. Having the more stringent requirements, according to C. Fowler, was necessary, because the students in the early childhood and care program will be educating very young children. The students in the program therefore must demonstrate competency before they are permitted to serve as instructors.</p> <p><u>DISCUSSION:</u></p> <p>M. Miller (Registrar) asked whether the early education and care methods courses had prerequisites or if they were open courses. This information was necessary for the Registrar’s office, as the office may need to prepare for any changes to the current requirements. R. Clarke Fowler responded that usually students need to pass certain courses before they can take the early education and care methods courses.</p> <p>R. Clarke Fowler asked if it was necessary to list all the prerequisites, an issue that would be more in the purview of the Curriculum Committee.</p> <p>Vice-Chair E. Duclos-Orsello recommended that the School of Education promptly reach out to the Curriculum Committee. The current proposal currently is not on the Curriculum Committee’s agenda.</p>

<p>Vote:</p>	<p>To approve Proposal 16:034 In favor (11). Against (0). Abstentions (0). Motion passed.</p>
<p>Motion:</p>	<p>B. Requirements for Entry into the Early Childhood and Care Practicum Courses (16:035)</p> <p>Motion to approve Proposal 16:035. Made by: D. Seger Seconded: S. Silvern</p> <p><u>OVERVIEW:</u></p> <p>R. Clarke Fowler (Chair, Early Education and Care) re-emphasized that the School of Education wants to ensure that students are doing quality work before they teach. For the practicum, students are working off site, often unsupervised. It therefore is imperative that students are well trained and competent.</p> <p><u>DISCUSSION:</u></p> <p>M. Miller noted that practicum courses typically are controlled by making admission “by permission only.”</p>
<p>Vote:</p>	<p>To approve Proposal 16:035 In favor (11). Against (0). Abstentions (0). Motion passed.</p>
<p>Motion:</p>	<p>C. Policy for Students Who Do Not Complete the Fifth Year of the 4+1 Program in Education (16:036)</p> <p>Motion to approve Proposal 16:036 Made by: P. Leong Seconded: K. Reker</p> <p><u>OVERVIEW:</u></p> <p>This proposal is for the licensure program in the School of Education. According to R. Clarke Fowler (Chair, Early Education and Care), the licensure program is competitive. Students apply in the middle of the spring semester during their sophomore year. There will be cohort models. Students will earn a bachelor’s degree, a master’s degree, and at least one license.</p> <p>If students decide they do not want to pursue their 5th year and teach, they should still be allowed to get a degree. This path, however, should not be a norm; rather, it is an option for exceptional circumstances that still enable students to receive their bachelor’s degree.</p> <p><u>DISCUSSION:</u></p> <p>Vice-Chair E. Duclos-Orsello emphasized that the 4+1 program is already in place, and that this current policy is simply a proviso.</p>

R. Clarke Fowler pointed out that on the third line of the proposed policy, the word “substiution” should be plural.

There was discussion about what might happen to graduate coursework credits should a student withdraw from the 4+1 program. M. Miller (Registrar) wondered whether a sentence should be added to the end of the proposal to include both undergraduate and graduate coursework credits. J. Cambone (Dean, School of Education) indicated that this was already implied.

M. Miller re-affirmed that if a student were to return to school, to a non-4+1 program, a credit used in the 4+1 program may not be used again. But if a student completes a 4+1 program but does not complete the fifth year, the institution would need to know what graduate work the student has completed, as the student would not be able to re-use those credits. M. Miller asked whether that student would be able to reuse those credits at a later point in time, especially if the student entered a different 4+1 program.

J. Cambone replied that it was logical that a student could re-use those credits if the student withdrew from his/her cohort, but that he would recommend a deferment on the student’s registration into the graduate program. M. Miller reiterated whether greater clarity (i.e. more explicit language) was needed around this kind of issue. J. Cambone stated that what is implied is that the credits may not be used for another program *unless* the student is returning to the graduate cohort model from which s/he withdrew.

Vice-Chair E. Duclos-Orsello noted that greater clarity could be achieved through advising and other services, but wondered whether, for transparency reasons, the language could be made more explicit. M. Miller concurred that more explicit language was needed.

J. Cambone mentioned that he had deliberated with faculty on this matter, and that the faculty in the School of Education did not contemplate the concerns that M. Miller had raised. The faculty, however, were emphatic in their belief that the policy should *not* actively encourage students to withdraw from the program.

D. Veira suggested that a policy could be there “just in case,” while not encouraging withdrawal.

J. Cambone indicated that in the educational licensure, there is an expiration date for coursework.

Vice-Chair E. Duclos-Orsello noted that the language of the existing policy basically stated in the affirmative that all existing Salem State graduate coursework apply. That is to say, graduate coursework can be used to fulfill undergraduate requirements, and that, if used in this capacity, cannot be used later for graduate credit in a graduate program at SSU.

C. Fowler felt that if one of his students took a graduate reading course to fulfill an undergraduate reading course, then that student could not use that graduate course to fulfill other courses.

	<p>Guest J. Whitlow (English) weighed in, noting that the concerns mentioned are issues that apply to all 4+1 programs at Salem State. In her view, it therefore made sense that language should be added to indicate that if a student withdraws from a 4+1 program and obtains only an undergraduate degree, that person must reapply to the graduate program if s/he decides to return sometime in the future. It was J. Whitlow’s belief that there should be a window of time for re-admission (one year, for instance). J. Cambone concurred with J. Whitlow’s assessment, feeling that the approach would be more systematic and less case-by-case.</p> <p>Guest M. Mobley (psychology) noted that these issues have not been raised by the psychology department.</p> <p>Vice-Chair E. Duclos-Orsello concluded that the committee seemed to be in favor of a broad policy for all 4+1 programs. She re-affirmed the need for a broad policy that is more explicit. She further re-affirmed that any blanket changes to the 4+1 programs will affect the current proposal, and all other policies that involve the 4+1 programs. Vice-Chair E. Duclos-Orsello further recommended that both the Graduate Education Council and the Curriculum Committee consider and address the issues raised above.</p>
<p>Motion:</p>	<p>Motion to approve 16:036 as corrected (add “s” to the word “substitution”).</p>
<p>Vote:</p>	<p>In favor (10). Against (0). Abstentions (1). Motion passed.</p>
<p>Motion:</p>	<p>D. Comprehensive Preferred Name Policy (16:038)</p>
	<p>There was an introduction of members associated with this policy. Representatives included staff from Diversity and Multicultural Affairs, staff from the Registrar’s office, faculty, representatives from the LGBTQ Taskforce, and 19 student members of The Alliance.</p>
<p>Motion:</p>	<p>Motion to approve Proposal 16:038</p>
	<p>Made by: J. Cambone</p>
	<p>Seconded: D. Veira</p>
	<p><u>OVERVIEW:</u></p>
	<p>R. Comage, Director of the Office of Diversity and Multicultural Affairs, provided an overview of the proposal. After meeting with the President’s Committee on Diversity, the LGBTQ Taskforce saw fit to adopt a preferred name policy. The Taskforce has relied on the Campus Pride Index, as well as other resources from different campuses. The Taskforce felt that a preferred name policy could help to create a more inclusive environment for students. The Taskforce currently partners with the University of Wisconsin, Madison, and uses UWisconsin Madison as a model. The Taskforce also has worked with Registrar M. Miller, in addition to many other campus representatives.</p>
	<p>Student members of The Alliance advocated for the preferred name policy.</p>

M. Keeley transitioned from female to male. At his previous institution, Northern Essex, his birth name was not an issue, as he could simply confide with his professors and instruct that his professors call him by his preferred name. But problems arose outside of the classroom. For one, swiping his I.D. card to access buildings forced him to confront his birth name upon each building entry. The visibility of his birth name, particularly when it occurred with regular occurrence, forced M. Keeley to revisit a discordant gender identity, creating an internal turmoil that interfered with his education. Beginning in 2013, with a name change, things looked brighter. When he signed into computers and with other electronic transactions, he saw that his name was his chosen and preferred name, which enabled him to go forward with his life rather than be reminded constantly of an identity to which he did not relate.

K. Mehalba felt that the preferred name policy was consistent with the other policies on campus (e.g., gender-inclusive bathrooms). She stated that for freshmen, the option of having a legal name change was not a possibility, so coming to campus, a safe space, at least allows students to feel safe. M. Roberts concurred, stating that since Salem State prides itself on being inclusive, this policy would ensure that all of campus would be a safe place.

E. Zecchini emphasized that the preferred name policy affects others beyond transgender students. An international student that she knows noted that the institution encribed his name incorrectly, but apparently could not correct the error. The preferred name policy would allow the international student a corrective option.

Another student member of The Alliance explained that the visibility and ever-presence of one's birth name, especially if it is discordant with one's gender identity, causes considerable turmoil, affecting one's mental health and overall quality of life.

DISCUSSION:

A question was raised about where the preferred name policy was already adopted. R. Comage and M. Miller replied that the preferred name policy has been implemented in Degree Tracker, Canvas, in the SSU email system, Student Center, class roster, and grade rosters. M. Miller noted that Salem State is continuing to expand the policy. In spring 2016, the preferred name will appear on the Clipper Card. D. Williams (Registrar's Office) noted that there are 70+ systems outside of the Peoplesoft Student Information System, and that the practice of using preferred names is well underway already.

Vice-Chair E. Duclos-Orsello emphasized that there are many reasons why people would wish to have a preferred name, and that all of the reasons are legitimate.

M. Keeley asked whether the preferred name would apply to U.S. mail. Will he receive Salem State mail with his birth name as the addressee? M. Miller replied that all financial aid and student account issues continue to use legal names, but the institution is evaluating other areas. At this time, Salem State is trying to avoid sending mail to students' home using their preferred names, in order to protect the students.

	<p>It was noted that the policy, as written, actually addresses the issue involving communications in different forms (including by U.S. mail).</p> <p>Vice-Chair E. Duclos-Orsello emphasized the last sentence of the policy: “The University does not guarantee that all internal systems will reflect [the] preferred name, but will continue to expand the internal use of preferred names across internal systems to support this goal.” In other words, the policy is not only committed to the practice of using preferred names, but it is striving to expand the use of preferred names over legal names.</p> <p>While attendees were very much motivated to continue the discussion on the importance of the preferred name policy, the meeting time had come to an end. J. Cambone stressed how important the policy was and urged committee members to vote on the policy at that point, rather than table it.</p> <p>Motion: Motion to accept Proposal 16:038</p> <p>Vote: In favor (11). Against (0). Abstentions (0). Motion passed unanimously.</p>
VI.	Other Business
Motion:	<p>Motion to extend the meeting. Made by: Chair P. Walker Seconded: None. Motion fails.</p>
VII.	Adjournment
Motion:	<p>Motion to adjourn Motion made by: D. Seger Seconded by: D. Veira</p>
Vote:	In favor (11). Against (0). Abstentions (0). Motion passed unanimously.
Adjourned	at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela Leong

Next Meeting: October 15, 2015 at 3:15 p.m., location TBA