

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Academic Requirements Committee](#) » [Annual Reports](#) » 2003-2004 Annual Report

Academic Requirements Committee

Annual Report 1997-98

July 14, 1998

TO: Maggie Niess, President
Faculty Senate President

FROM: Mary Ann Matzke, Chair
Academic Requirements Committee
Members: Polly Gross, Phil Rossignol, Tracy Bentley-Townlin, Susan Longerbeam, Neil Eldin, Barbara Roth, Larry Flick, Kurt Peters, Brandon Antoni (student), Christine May (student), Ron Oliveira (ex-officio)

SUBJECT: Annual Report 1997-98

The Academic Requirements Committee (ARC) met weekly during 1997-98 to review and make decisions on petitions from students requesting exceptions to the academic regulations. A summary of these decisions appears at the end of this report. In addition, the committee was involved in a year-long project to review and modify the petition process. I would like to thank the hard-working committee for the extra hours spent on the review process and Leslie Burns for her assistance with the focus groups.

Review of the petitioning process:

In summer of 1997 the Registrar expressed dissatisfaction with the current petitioning process. Due to staff cutbacks and changes, she felt it was no longer possible to continue with the current process as it was very time intensive for the Registrars staff, students, advisers, and the committee.

Meetings were held with the ARC and the Registrars Office. As a result of these meetings, Leslie Burns, Director of Undergraduate Academic Programs, offered to lead five focus group meetings to gain a better understanding of the perceptions of and issues/concerns with the petition and review process. Two groups of faculty and advisers, one group of students, the ARC and the Registrars Office met during the fall and early winter. The sessions were recorded and a report was prepared by Leslie Burns. The following changes were made following the Focus Group report and on-going discussions with the Registrars Office:

1. A memo was written from the ARC to the Registrars Office clarifying that the Registrar would automatically approve petitions in certain categories. This year 49% of the add/drop requests and 68% of the miscellaneous category requests were automatically approved.
2. The petition form was changed into two different forms - one dealing with registration changes and one with miscellaneous requests (extension of I, exam for credit, etc.). The new format is easier for the Registrars Office to process and requires fewer signatures.
3. Written guidelines for both faculty and students were prepared. The faculty guidelines were presented at the April Academic Advising Council meeting. The student guidelines are being distributed with the petition form.
4. Several meetings were held with the Academic Regulations Committee to discuss changes that would simplify the petition process. The revision of AR2 was implemented and the Academic Requirements Committee will no longer review vo-tech course credits.

Recommendations:

1. Post Faculty Guidelines for Student Petitions on the web. Remind faculty of deadlines to drop and withdraw from classes, ask their assistance in providing information regarding attendance on petitions, and ask that they inform students of their performance in class prior to the withdraw deadline.
2. Continue to work on simplifying the petition process by delegating more approvals to the Registrars Office when appropriate.
3. AR12 (Withdrawal from Individual Courses). We recommend that the Faculty Senate reconsider the withdrawal deadline. We feel that the 7th week deadline is not supported by the faculty and should be extended.
4. In AR 13 (Withdrawal from the University). The wording is vague and has been interpreted to include the weekend or up to the day the student takes his/her first final. Recommend: State that the deadline is 5:00 p.m. on the Friday before Finals Week.
5. AR13. Discuss with the Academic Regulations Committee what the guidelines should be for a late withdrawal. Should there be a time limit on a request to late withdraw?
6. AR23d (Exam for Credit) ARC recommends that students be allowed to take an exam for credit in the term in which he or she completes requirements for graduation.
7. AR23 and 24 (Exam for Credit/Waiver) should be reexamined in light of the PASS (Proficiency Based Admission System) which will be in effect at OSU in Fall 2001. Students coming in from high school at a higher proficiency level may wish to test for credit. Currently our regulation does not allow credit based on work done in high school.
8. Continue discussions with the Student Health Center concerning medical documentation of illnesses. Currently it is the Health Center's policy not to provide medical excuses for absenteeism from classes or exams. However, the ARC feels that medical information is sometimes needed when a student requests a late withdraw from an individual course or from the term.

Academic Requirements Committee Final Report
1997-98

	Approved	Denied	Total	% Total	
Grade Changes by Petition	36	101	137	5.24%	
Special Exams	78	5	83	3.17%	
E Grades	0	0	0	0%	
Adds/Drops	1644 (935*)	273	1917	73.42%	
Withdrawals	155	133	293	11.22%	
Miscellaneous	96 (67*)	2	98	3.75%	
Other Miscellaneous	62	21	83	3.17%	
TOTALS	2071	540	2611	100%	

*Automatically approved and included in Approved totals.

Note: The number of student petitions continues to increase. Total number of petitions considered was 1491 in 95-96; 2,106 in 96-97; and 2,611 in 97-98.

cc: 1997-98 Academic Requirements Committee
Barbara Balz, Registrar
Ron Oliveira, Associate Registrar
Leslie Burns, Director of Undergraduate Academic Programs