

IUPUI Faculty Council Committee Annual Report 2017-2018

Committee Name: Academic Affairs

Chair: Mark W. McK. Bannatyne, Ph.D., prof. dr hab.

Members: Term Expiring June 30, 2019:

Boyne, Shawn (Nursing), Crowder, Sharron (Nursing), Fu, Yao (PETM), Magee, Paula (Education), White, Angela (University Library)

Term Expiring June 30, 2018:

Bannatyne, Mark (Engineering & Technology) (Chair), Gavrin, Andrew (Science), Srinivasan, Mythily (Dentistry), Thedwall, Kate (Liberal Arts), Zimmers, Teresa (Medicine)

Liaisons for 2017-2018 (or Ex Officio):

Gladden, James (University College) (Administrative Liaison), Myers, Mary Beth (Registrar) (Ex-Officio), Watt, Jeff X. (Science) (Executive Committee Liaison)

Action Items:

Action Item(s)	Status
The main request given to this committee by the Faculty Council Executive Committee (FCEC) for the academic year was to review ideas on the use of transcribed credits being counted for award of both major and minor programs.	Task completed and report issued to FCEC.

<p>The topic of the requiring specific campus policies to be listed in all course syllabi was again addressed briefly this year. The required policies related to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disability Accommodations 2. Academic Integrity 3. Religious Holidays 4. Sexual Misconduct 5. Education and Title VI 	<p>Discussion completed and recommendations again forwarded to FCEC.</p>
<p>The committee looked extensively throughout the full academic year at the issue of how degrees are awarded on diverse campuses, and even internationally*, by programs within the IU and Purdue systems, and how they might affect programs on the IUPUI campus.</p>	<p>Ongoing and recommended for further action in 2018-2019 as noted below. (Please see full Final Report for specific details of this issue.)</p>
<p>AAC members volunteered to serve on the ad hoc committee was created by the IFC Executive Committee to review the current Principles of Undergraduate Learning and Principles of Co-Curricular Learning, and report back to the Executive Committee their recommendation as to whether or not these Principles should be amended in light of the new Common Core.</p>	<p>Completed.</p>
<p>The committee reviewed the rewording of the "Faculty Sponsorship of Student for Admission as a Beginning Freshman" policy, and agreed on several slight changes which they believed reflected the present needs of the campus. The required motions to adopt the changes were presented by the Chair to the Faculty Council and passed as amended.</p>	<p>Completed and passed by Faculty Council.</p>
<p>A request was received from the Faculty Council Executive Committee that the AAC make any recommendations as early as possible in the Fall semester which they felt were necessary concerning the new date approved for the 2018 Commencement date and time (scheduled for May 13, 2018).</p>	<p>Completed and recommendations sent to FCEC.</p>
<p>The AAC may wished to review and recommend to the Faculty Affairs Committee standards used in hiring adjunct faculty.</p>	<p>This matter was not pursued during this academic year as other matters presently under consideration had not been concluded.</p>
<p>The committee took up the issue of some slight conflicts in wording that appeared to exist between the 'Code of Student Conduct and Responsibilities', and the 'Grade Replacement Policy' used by the Office of the Registrar.</p>	<p>Completed and reported.</p>

Action Items to be carried over to 2017-2018:

Action Item(s)	Status
Continue review of Credit Transfers and Residency	In progress

Suggested new action items for 2017-2018:

Action Item(s)	Status
The committee may wish to address the issue of standards used in hiring adjunct faculty.	Left to future committee for consideration at its pleasure.

Please attach any completed documents, minutes, or recommendations made by your committee during this report year. One copy of this report and supporting documents will be sent to the IUPUI University Archives.

(Please see attachment of the full AAC Final Report which includes detailed information on all issues documented above, and the e-mail memo sent to all Deans on the IUPUI campus regarding Credit Transfer and Residency Policies.)

Report due: June 30, 2018

**Submit to: May 26, 2018 to Karen Lee
Office of the Faculty Council
klee2@iupui.edu**

**Annual Report of the Academic Affairs Committee
2017-2018**

Committee Members for this Academic Year

Members with Term Expiring June 30, 2019:

Boyne, Shawn (Nursing), Crowder, Sharron (Nursing), Fu, Yao (PETM), Magee, Paula (Education), White, Angela (University Library)

Members with Term Expiring June 30, 2018:

Bannatyne, Mark (Engineering & Technology) (Chair), Gavrin, Andrew (Science), Srinivasan, Mythily (Dentistry), Thedwall, Kate (Liberal Arts), Zimmers, Teresa (Medicine)

Liaisons for 2016-2017 (or Ex Officio):

Gladden, James (University College) (Administrative Liaison), Myers, Mary Beth (Registrar) (Ex-Officio), Watt, Jeff X. (Science) (Executive Committee Liaison)

Actions and Resolutions

1. As the membership of this committee represents so many schools and departments, finding a meeting time when the majority of the members could be present was an ongoing challenge. The committee used "Doodle" survey which allowed everyone to identify hours when their schedule allowed them to meet. This proved to be a solution everyone was able to use and helped promote meetings where most members would be able to meet. The Chair also met personally with members at the beginning of the academic year whose schedules did not allow them to meet so that he could discuss their participation via e-mail or other communications sources.
2. The main request given to this committee by the Faculty Council Executive Committee (FCEC) for the academic year was to review ideas on the use of transcribed credits being counted for award of both major and minor programs. The Chair noted that the FCEC is not asking for a definitive policy to be written, but rather that the committee review what (if any) practices exist in regards to the distribution and acceptance of credits in regards to being counted for multiple degrees or certificates and offered their opinion on whether or not a standard policy be generated and applied across the campus. This matter was reviewed at several meetings as indicated by a synopsis of the major discussion points shown below:
 - a. This matter should initially concentrate at the BS level for the moment, and be related primarily to areas of study, and not to major programs. Discussion was heard that areas such as General Education Core subjects should be

reviewed, but not necessarily courses taken within a prescribed major. For example, classes offered within the major of both Education and Math allow “double dipping” (the application of credits earned) to satisfy both a major and minor within their programs.

Watt mentioned specifically that math majors can receive additional certificates or minors by taking courses within both math or computer science where these courses are used to not only substitute for required courses in the major plan of study, but also can count toward a certificate or minor. Magee and Bannatyne both mentioned that such practices happened within their programs also.

Some discussion was heard on how the new practice of “Banded Tuition” might play into any application of credit distribution and it was the opinion of those present that we should look further into this area as this topic is discussed further at subsequent meetings.

Discussion was also heard on how applying credits might affect students seeking a double major. Watt gave a very detailed account of how this might Math and Physics majors as the courses required in both programs parallel each other so closely in several of their tracks. The programs in Physics are so dependent on math courses that it is an easy matter for those students who wish to do so to receive a degree in both areas by a careful selection of courses in either area that will satisfy both degrees. As this discussion went forward, Watt specifically noted that it should be understood that this practice applied to those pursuing dual majors and that it should be understood that within both Math and Physics students cannot use dual credit to receive a major and minor in the same program track.

The opinion of the AAC was sent by the Chair to the Faculty Council Executive Committee for their consideration.

- b. The topic of the requiring specific campus policies to be listed in all course syllabi was again addressed briefly this year. The required policies related to:
 1. Disability Accommodations
 2. Academic Integrity
 3. Religious Holidays
 4. Sexual Misconduct
 5. Education and Title VI

(See: <https://iu.app.box.com/s/t22rlgiaat8ok3xykwjs3d49csmnyy8z>)

Views were heard as to the best way to ensure 100% compliance with such require statements on policies which included having all statements inserted into

course pages on Canvas. Opinions were heard as to the desire by many to keep syllabi centered on the outline and needs of each course and the inclusion of such statements would be a duplication of these policies which are found in other student resources. It was also noted that there was a "Campus Policies" link in Canvas where such statements could easily be accessed and perhaps a similar link could be embedded in Canvas.

3. The committee looked extensively throughout the full academic year at the issue of how degrees are awarded on diverse campuses, and even internationally*, by programs within the IU and Purdue systems, and how they might affect programs on the IUPUI campus. This discussion heard at the initial meeting where this topic was raised included the following information:
 - 40% of students in the IU system are from outside Indiana (approximately 50% in the Purdue system) and bring credits from a wide diversity of other academic institution as transfer courses.
 - There are also courses which are still quite specific to both IU and Purdue which students at IUPUI take to satisfy their degrees regardless of which school will grant their diploma.
 - IU maintains a policy of transfer students having to take at least 32 credit hours at the campus which will grant their degree. Purdue allows for credits to be taken at any campus within its system, and the diploma to be granted at whichever campus the students chooses to complete their degree.
 - How does offering similar courses on different campuses fit into the transfer policies of each university?

(*At present IU has not structure in place to grant off shore degrees for all programs and the issue of students receiving credit for taking online courses from foreign countries which could count toward graduation may become a more important issue in the future.)

A survey (included at the end of this report) was generated and sent to all Deans asking that it be distributed to all Program and Department Chairs for feedback. The survey asked for data on how transfer credits were handled, required on campus residency, etc. Initially not all schools responded, so a second contact was made with schools which resulted in more data being received. (Members Sharron Crowder and Teresa Zimmers requested that a copy of the questionnaire which was sent out to all Deans on "Credit Transfer, Credit Application, and Residency" be sent to them for review and distribution to their schools which resulted in more data being received.)

The following is a brief outline of some of the major points that were heard in all the discussions held concerning this matter:

- a. A review of the responses to the questionnaire sent showed that no school considered, nor accepted, remedial credits for work done below bachelor level status.
- b. The issue of how many credits could be received, and how many credits should be taken at IUPUI toward the issuing of a diploma received considerable attention. Expressions as to 32 credit hours being used by some schools at IUPUI might not be enough were heard along with opinions that we must consider the need of some students who may do the majority of their work at other institutions, either in or outside the State of Indiana, and finding themselves under the necessity of returning before their studies are complete. Such incidences may include reasons due to health, family need, financial distress, etc. Keeping a reasonable level of on-campus credits could allow these students to graduate rather than having to surrender all their studies without a degree being granted. The level of on-campus credits was also discussed with opinions as to the need for 300 and 400-level classes, and capstone courses, being a part of the residency requirement in such cases.
- c. Concerns were expressed as to the “run around” or “shopping” practices of some students who may try and pursue degrees by opting for classes in different schools due to their effort to accomplish graduation through taking classes which are seen as being easier than posted requirements in their major. Mention was made that IUPUI Policy sets a limit on the number of courses, or credits, which may be transferred after a student has matriculated.
- d. The issue of counting credits taken more than once for second majors, minors, or certificates was heard at length. It was the opinion of those present that this practice is commonly administered throughout higher education in the USA, and that it did serve the students and programs well. However, some discussion was heard on the number of credits that should be required for achieving a double major. Opinions were expressed that often the “double dipping” of credits could be used to reduce the rigor of a second major. The example of the double major between Mathematics and Physics was given as to the proper rigor which should be applied as students in this program to fulfill the major core courses in each major to satisfy the double degree. (Mathematics (24) + Physics (38) = 68 core credits)
- e. Discussion was heard on the need to apply some requirements as to the level and amount of credits that should be taken for a double major to be issued. While 150 credits were used as a starting point for this discussion, it was not proposed that this would be an appropriate number of credits for all programs.

The Chair proposed that a review of the practice of issuing double majors by IUPUI's peer institution be reviewed so that future discussions could have a benchmark upon which to base opinions on this matter. (The Chair made such a review and reported back to the members of the committee prior to the next meeting.) NOTE: All data received was compiled by the Chair and circulated to committee members. The matter was not concluded in this past academic year, and it is recommended that this issue be taken up for further work by the committee during the 2018-2019 academic year.

- f. At present, if a student completes the required 30 credits of a General Education block at any Indiana public institution, that institution is required to place a milestone on the student transcript recognizing the successful completion of the General Education Core at that institution. If a student then transfers, the receiving institution must accept completion of the general education requirement. If a student has completed some General Education classes, but not enough to complete the block and receive the milestone on the official record, those courses will be evaluated individually at the receiving institution and articulated accordingly to the policies of the receiving institution. It is the privilege of each campus to accept any transfer request which does not have a direct relationship to a specified course as being 'undistributed' and used 'where' or 'if' that campus feels it is appropriate.
- g. All present expressed that they were comfortable for the most part with the policies and procedures currently used by schools and the campus for such applications.
- h. Opinions were heard as to what constituted appropriate campus residency, and how was campus residency seen for courses offered online where students in the course may not only be residing in Indiana, but also living in other States or countries. It was noted that in the past, students had been restricted to the number of online or correspondence courses they could take due to their perceived rigor.
- i. The opinion that as online courses have now been taught for many years, and as instructors have much better technology available to them for teaching, that the fear associated with 'rigor' has greatly diminished. As such, students participating in online instruction are offered a quality of instruction parallel to that being offered in many regards on the campus. In regards to campus residency, the opinion of 'our courses – our degree' was offered for comment to all present. The comments heard in regards to this supported the notion that programs should be able to award campus residency credit to all those who take their classes as they are the authority solely responsible for that course's content and delivery. It was also heard that by allowing no restriction to campus residency for those taking an online class who may

be located out of State, that it could be a boon to enrollment numbers also.

- It was the consensus of all present that courses offered by this campus, in any format, should count towards campus residency requirements for graduation.
 - In terms of awarding the final degree, campus residency should be an issue in determining who can receive a diploma from a particular campus. The example of the School of Science was offered wherein it requires that a specified number of credit hours (32) at the 300-400 levels must be taken by those who wish to receive their final degree from IUPUI. (It was noted that in past years, it was stipulated that the Senior Year had to be completed on the campus, but this allowed for students to forestall taking Gen Ed and lower division class until their final year and still receive their diploma at a particular campus. This was later changed to reflect the current practice of 300-400 level courses being required on the awarding campus.)
4. The committee reviewed the rewording of the “Faculty Sponsorship of Student for Admission as a Beginning Freshman” policy, and agreed on several slight changes which they believed reflected the present needs of the campus. The required motions to adopt the changes were presented by the Chair to the Faculty Council and passed as amended.
 5. An ad hoc committee was created by the IFC Executive Committee to review the current Principles of Undergraduate Learning and Principles of Co-Curricular Learning, and report back to the Executive Committee their recommendation as to whether or not these Principles should be amended in light of the new Common Core. This committee Chair asked for any volunteers to serve and received a response from Angela White. The Chair also served and invited Kate Thedwall to serve as the other representative from the AAC, who willingly accepted. Progress on the work of this ad hoc committee was given to members of the AAC. All feedback from AAC Members was taken back to the ad hoc committee for their consideration.

The following is a synopsis of the opinions expressed which were taken back to the ad hoc committee for their consideration:

- a. The draft document in question dated March 5, 2018 included comments from diverse faculty across the campus. Since that date, newer versions which include several minor edits in regards to wording have been issued by the Task Force charged with the review of the PULs/PCLs.
- b. Although this document will establish new versions of the PULs/PCLs, many faculty have been heard to express the opinion that they believe this

document will be largely ignored and simply go away. Others believe that the document is not particularly pertinent to their field, or specific responsibilities on the campus, and will therefore not be implemented.

- c. Opinions were expressed as to how the new PULs/PCLs will figure into the assessment of student work, and raised the questions as to why the campus at this time believes there is a need for new PULs/PCLs. It was mentioned that although the immediate need for the new PULs/PCLs may be unclear to some, that the process used to review and rewrite them appears to have been valid and well thought out.
 - d. Remarks were heard on whether or not there would be enough time before the next campus accreditation visit (2022) to implement and collect valuable data from the new PULs/PCLs. There was some question whether there would be enough time to roll out the new PULs/PCLs and use them effectively in the assessment of programs so that the self-study issued to the accreditation body would have some validity.
 - e. Discussion was also heard on whether or not the placing of the 'examples' offered in the draft document had been adequately written, or placed in the appropriate section of the document. Again, discussion was heard as to the implementation of such examples, and how they would be pertinent to many of the programs on the campus. It was mentioned that the examples are simply that, and not a checklist to be strenuously adhered to, but rather to act as a guide to each program. It would be left to the individual schools and programs on the campus to review the example and amend it to fit the needs. Each course or program would be left to ensure that the goals outlined in each section of the document could be adapted to meet the objectives of each school.
 - f. Those participating in this review generally agreed that the most recent document offered is much better than the previous drafts which have been circulated for campus review. The document was seen as a good job overall to date, but those present were also anticipating the next version.
6. A request was received from the Faculty Council Executive Committee that the AAC make any recommendations as early as possible in the Fall semester which they felt were necessary concerning the new date approved for the 2018 Commencement date and time (scheduled for May 13, 2018). All agreed to hear this matter at the

November meeting. A synopsis of what was heard during those discussion follows in the order the opinions were expressed:

- a. The faculty were asked to express their opinion(s) in regards to moving the Commencement from Mother's Day to the Saturday prior. The response was overwhelmingly in favor of such a move. This was also favored by the Chancellor who presides at IUPUI.
- b. It would be best to remember that there are a high percentage of Purdue University students on the IUPUI campus and their needs should be considered seriously in making such a move.
- c. It was mentioned that should schools on this campus wish to have other ceremonies in addition to Commencement, that they were instructed not to allow the wearing of ceremonial regalia at such meetings. The wearing of robes, hoods, etc. should be reserved expressly for the Commencement ceremony only.
- d. It was noted that only one Trustee was present at the last Commencement which was disappointing to many of the faculty.
- e. All professional schools should be present at the Commencement. It was expressed that all schools should be present at Commencement to help represent the full academic experience offered at IUPUI.
- f. A smaller, more intimate ceremony is preferred by most participants, and the Commencement as presently run is too overwhelming to many.
- g. Representatives, if not the Presidents themselves, from both hierarchies of the partner universities should be present at Commencement.
- h. It should be remembered that Graduation is for the students, and not the administration in any manner.
- i. Extra days which might be required for families to attend should be taken into account in light of the time required to stay in Indianapolis for those from out-of-town, and the cost of accommodations and meals.
- j. Commencement should last a maximum of 100 minutes.
- k. Services available to guests (specifically food service) were not satisfactory for the length of time in which they must be present during Commencement (early arrival and long ceremony).

- l. The length of the Commencement could be greatly reduced by having students enter in multiple lines from several directions simultaneously.
- m. All traditions usually attendant in the Commencement cannot be implemented and time reduced. Some parts of the ceremony would have to be eliminated in order to reduce the length of Commencement.
- n. IUPUI's commitment to service in this community must be remembered as most students come from this area.
- o. School ceremonies should not be surrendered as they have become an integral part of those traditions and people look forward to the smaller, more personal attention that happens in those meetings.
- p. The question of where or when hooding should take place was heard with no definitive conclusion. This is a point that could be discussed further.
- q. Discussion was also heard on when and where the diploma covers should be handed out (requires further input from members of the committee).

Once all comments received at the meeting, and later by e-mail had been gathered, the Chair will prepare a report which was forwarded to the Executive Committee, and circulated to all members of the AAC for their review. The report raised the attention of Chancellor Paydar who requested he be allowed to come to the AAC Meeting to address some concerns he had with this matter. His request was granted and he was accompanied by Dr. Fitzpatrick.

At the December 2017 meeting of the AAC, Chancellor Paydar provided a comprehensive overview of the history of Commencement at IUPUI, and the reasons behind the move to propose a change in its date each year. The Chancellor's remarks then went on to include the following points:

- a. In an effort to ensure students participate in greater numbers at Commencement, any ceremonies which are conducted prior to Commencement should not include the wearing of robes or other official graduation regalia as this tends to make students feel they have graduated and there is no need to attend Commencement.
- b. The Chancellor stated that he wished to support schools which have a long tradition of recognition ceremonies (i.e. Nursing) to continue with their traditions. As extra time and space in the Lucas Oil Stadium and the Indiana Convention Center will not be available after 2019 for such services to be provided, his office will support the costs of holding such ceremonies at other

locations so these traditions may continue, as long as they are non-robed celebrations.

Opinions were heard by those present regarding certain aspects of Commencement such as its scheduling, length of the ceremony, details about other ceremonies held in diverse schools in the campus, etc. The Chancellor responded to all questions to the satisfaction of those present.

The Chancellor and Dr. Fitzpatrick then took a few minutes to outline the work being done by Dr. Fitzpatrick and others on a committee called to oversee all aspects of the Commencement and those present heard several details as how the committee was working and issues they were presently discussion. Dr. Fitzpatrick invited anyone interested to participate in working on this committee to present their name for an appointment to serve. (The Chair offered to serve if needed.)

In a final comment, the Chair remarked that the work of the AAC was not to make changes to the Graduation Ceremony, but offer their help in reviewing and suggesting changes which might better support the students in being able to attend. This seemed to clarify the work that committee had done and why it had offered the report that was sent to the Faculty Council Executive Committee.

7. The Chair suggested that the AAC may wish to review and recommend to the Faculty Affairs Committee standards used in hiring adjunct faculty. This matter was not pursued during this academic year as other matters presently under consideration had not been concluded.
8. The committee took up the issue of some slight conflicts in wording that appeared to exist between the 'Code of Student Conduct and Responsibilities', and the 'Grade Replacement Policy' used by the Office of the Registrar. This matter was referred to both the Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Committees by the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee for consideration. Prior to this meeting, an opinion on this matter were submitted to the Chair via e-mail from Andrew Gavrin (Science) whose comments were read during the discussion as he could not be present.

The following is a synopsis of the discussion was heard on this issue and the following actions taken:

- a. The policy of grade replacement was reviewed for those present by Jeff Watt which included comments on how this matter recently came before the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council for review. These comments detailed how the practice of grade replacement is usually handled at the Department level, and that not all grades which are reduced due to inappropriate action on the part of the student should be referred to the Registrar for action. Dr. Watt's comments about the intent of replacing a lower grade, as opposed to a reduced

or failing grade assigned due to academic misconduct, were explained in great detail.

The practice used by the Office of the Registrar of placing a 'Star' next to a grade that had been received due to academic misconduct was also included in the comments heard. Stars do not appear on the transcript, but are visible on the electronic record which can be viewed by the Office of the Registrar. These Stars are used as a code to indicate that the grade received for that course was assigned due to academic misconduct. While a student is allowed to repeat a class to replace a low grade assigned in their first attempt, grades received due to academic misconduct cannot be replaced in the calculation used to generate the student's GPA.

- b. Several other comments were heard on this issue by those present. It was suggested, and supported by all present, that the wording used in the grades assigned due to academic dishonesty be changed from only stipulating a grade of 'F' to reflect 'any grade' received due to such conduct. In support of this opinion, Kimberly Lewis read aloud the policy used by the Kokomo campus for the consideration of all present:

"When a student receives a grade of F or a lowered grade as an academic sanction, the Registrar will note the academic sanction in the student information system..."

The Chair asked that this statement be forwarded to him for inclusion in the minutes. (This statement was received by the Chair as requested.)

- c. Those present agreed that this Committee recommend that the wording of the grade change policy in question be changed to show an amendment in the wording specific to the grade received by the student. (Both the present policy wording and suggested amendments are shown below.)

Policy as presently written:

"If the penalty includes a failing grade for the course, the Registrar will be notified that the grade was given because of academic misconduct. The Registrar will record the grade of "F" on the student's permanent academic transcript without any notation concerning the reason for the grade. In accordance with other academic policies or procedures, such as the "FX" or grade replacement policy, the Registrar must, however, follow procedures to ensure that the grade of "F" will not thereafter be removed from the transcript. An "F" given because of academic misconduct must be calculated in a determination of the student's grade point average, but the grade will not prevent the student from repeating the same course for credit."

Suggested amendment (with bold added):

“If the penalty includes a **specific grade or grade reduction** for the course, the Registrar will be notified that the grade was given because of academic misconduct. The Registrar will record the grade of "F" on the student's permanent academic transcript without any notation concerning the reason for the grade. In accordance with other academic policies or procedures, such as the “FX” or grade replacement policy, the Registrar must, however, follow procedures to ensure that the grade of "F" will not thereafter be removed from the transcript. An “F” given because of academic misconduct must be calculated in a determination of the student's grade point average, but the grade will not prevent the student from repeating the same course for credit.”

The issue was resolved and the wording presented to the Faculty Council where it the required motions were presented and passed.

End of official report.

Submitted by:



May 26, 2018

Dr. Mark W. McK. Bannatyne, prof. dr hab.
Chair of the IUPUI Academic Affairs Committee

(Please see “Supplemental Materials” section on the following pages.)

Supplemental Materials

1. Copy of e-mail Memo on “Credit Transfer and Residency” sent to all Deans on the IUPUI campus during the Fall 2017 semester:

My Friends and Colleagues,

This year, the Academic Affairs committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council has been asked by the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive to review the policies and procedures used by our campus in regards to two important matters:

- a. The acceptance and application of credits taken at schools or programs at other campuses which count toward graduation
- b. The residency requirements required by programs for graduation

After reviewing information related to these matters, it became clear that these policies are handled very differently in some instances by each of our parent universities.

In an effort to formulate a clear and workable recommendation to the IFC on how our campus should address these issues, our committee is soliciting comments from the responsible faculty or senior staff members in your school on how they apply the acceptance of credits toward graduation and residency. We welcome any and all comments which may be singular to your departments due to particular program needs, or accreditation policies.

Responses to the questions shown below will be received until the end of business on Friday, Feb. 17, 2017. All comments should be forwarded to: acc2017@iupui.edu

Please limit responses for each question to 40 words or less. Should you wish to add additional comments, you are welcome to attach a WORD or PDF to your response which includes your further thoughts.

1. Are all credits from courses required in your program accepted from statewide campuses, and other institutions, counted toward graduation?
2. Is there a general policy your program follows which governs the total number of credits accepted from statewide campuses or other institutions which count toward graduation? (If yes, please attach brief policy statement.)

3. Can credits used in one degree program in your department also be counted for graduation credit toward another major, minor, or certificate?
4. Does your program/department have specific residency requirements in regards to how many credits must be taken on this campus? (If yes, please attach brief policy statement.)
5. If a person is not living in Indiana, and takes a course online offered by your program, are the credits generated counted toward residency?

Should you have any questions related to our request, you are most welcome to contact me as indicated below.

Most respectfully,

(Signature image appeared here)

Mark W. McK. Bannatyne, Ph.D., prof. dr. hab.
Chair, Academic Affairs Committee
IUPUI

(End of Supplemental materials)