PRESENTATION OF THE AGENDA

D. Zinger moved to adopt the agenda. S. Marsh seconded. Motion carried.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Introductions

B. Approval of May 9, 2012 minutes

J. Wolfskill moved to approve the amended minutes for 5/9/12, seconded by D. Zinger. Motion carried.

III. New Business

A. Acceptance of APASC Annual Report 2011-2012

S. Marsh asked that an editorial change be made on page 3 under the College of Business. It should read as follows:

“…APASC approved the renewal of limited admission/retention for all the programs of the COB.”
S. Eaton asked about the status of the plus/minus grading.

A. Birberick said the APASC minutes for the plus/minus grading were approved and now they go to the University Coordinating Council and will be presented at their next meeting which is September 6. She stated that if this is approved at all levels, then the plus/minus grading would go into effect Fall 2013.

M. Myles moved to accept APASC’s Annual Report 2011-2012 with one amendment. D. Zinger seconded. Motion carried.

B. Selection of Chair for 2012-2013

S. Marsh nominated Eric Mogren to be the chair of APASC for 2012-2013. Eric Mogren accepted the nomination.

C. Curricular Items referred by CUC

- COLLEGE OF EDUCATION #14, April 17, 2012
  Department of Special and Early Education
  Other Catalog Change Undergraduate Catalog

**Emphasis 2. Vision Impairments and Special Education (B.S.Ed.)**

M. Myles stated that the 2.50 GPA is an university requirement not an ISBE requirement. Anyone in the teacher certification program must have a 2.50 GPA to graduate.

A. Birberick indicated that the language change is to be compliant with state requirements and internal university requirements.

M. Myles indicated that the ICTS Test of Academic Proficiency replaces the Basic Skills Test. This test must be successfully completed by state law to be admitted into a teacher certification program.

After some discussion it was decided to refer Emphasis 2 – Vision Impairments and Special Education (B.S.Ed.) back to the College of Education for changes in catalog language.

J. Wolfskill suggested a change in the language under Vision Impairments from “To continue to enroll, students must …” to “To continue to remain in the program, students must maintain a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.50.”

J. Wolfskill moved to refer the presented catalog changes for Emphasis 2 – Vision Impairments and Special Education (B.S.Ed.) back to the College of Education with editorial suggestions. S. Marsh seconded. Motion carried.
Readmission of Former NIU Students

J. Wolfskill moved to approve the readmission of former students language from Liberal Arts and Sciences. E. Mogren seconded.

J. Wolfskill stated that according to this language and existing policy for students that are dismissed, it says students may request consideration for the benefits. So the student does not have to make this request. He stated that in certain situations it may be appropriate or to the student’s advantage not to request the benefits. He indicated that this then would be negotiated between the student and their advisor.

E. Mogren asked what the “returning student special readmission policy” was. He asked what the difference was between the “readmission policy” and the “special readmission policy”.

A. Birberick said that she believed the “special” was within the context of the ten year readmission. This is different than readmission within a year or so after being academically dismissed.

E. Mogren said this “special readmission policy” is not defined. He asked if this “special readmission policy” is different than the “readmission policy” that is clearly articulated.

A. Birberick said that according to the rationale, students that left on academic probation had this option, but not students that left for other reasons. This option is now being extended to all students no matter the reason for leaving.

E. Mogren asked what the difference was between “reinstatement” which is how it appears in the rationale and “readmission” which is how it appears in the title and new language.

M. Myles said that “reinstatement” applies to someone that has been dismissed and is applying to be reinstated to the institution. Readmission applies to someone that has left for other reasons under good standing and wants to come back.

J. Wolfskill withdrew his previous motion and proposed to table this pending a clarification of the wording from the advising deans. D. Zinger seconded.

Motion carried.
Credit from Community Colleges

J. Wolfskill said that when this policy was adapted four years ago with PeopleSoft it appeared that we simplified the system without causing much harm. In reading the rationale, it appears that the case is made that students are able to fulfill a major program with an inappropriate amount of community college coursework. He said that is seemed we were giving degraded degrees.

A. Birberick said just because classes transfer in it does not mean they apply to a degree.

M. Myles stated that before PeopleSoft we would take the most relevant 66 hours from Illinois community colleges. When PeopleSoft started we could not limit it to 66. We transferred in as many as we could and then applied 66 hours toward a degree.

There was a discussion pertaining to what information appears on transcripts. J. Montag clarified the difference between an official and an unofficial transcript. The official transcript represents the summary of the number of transfer hours accepted by NIU; however, the unofficial transcript itemizes and lists the equivalent coursework accepted in transfer. The degree audit reflects the manner in which courses, both transfer and NIU, satisfy NIU requirements.

A. Birberick said there is an advantage bringing in all transferrable courses even though only 66 can be used toward a program. If the student changes their major, then an advisor can re-do a transcript analysis and some of the other courses could be pulled for that major. She said that there is some flexibility being offered. Also, the 66 credit rule does not exempt transfer students from taking 54 hours at NIU.

J. Wolfskill said that he feels the proposed language would lead to many problems.

A. Birberick emphasized again that this takes away flexibility from the student and the advisor. She stated that she does not know why we would want to modify this policy. It falls to the colleges and departments to make a determination what coursework transfers.

J. Wolfskill proposed that this be tabled and that APASC invite a representative from Liberal Arts and Sciences to come to our next meeting to argue the case for this. Specifically, for them to explain what is wrong with the current system. If possible, with names redacted, give examples of cases that are believed to be problematic. D. Zinger seconded. Motion carried.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Minutes submitted by Lisa Allison.