1. Attendance:
Aero – J. P. Chen
AVN – Chul Lee
BME – Rita Alevriadou
CHE – Dave Tomasko
CEGS –
   Civil - Chuck Moore
   Environment – Not present (Bob Sykes)
CSE – Bruce Weide – Chair
ECE – George Valco
ENG PHY – Richard Hughes
FAB – Not present
IWSE –
   ISE – Not present (Blaine Lilly)
   WLD – Charlie Albright
MSE – Rob Wagoner
ME – Not present (Mike Moran)
Graduate Student – Shivraman Giri (Not present Justin McKendry)
Undergraduate Student – Linda Wang (Not present Ashley Hand)
Secretary – Ed McCaul
Guests – Bob Gustafson, Rich Hart

2. The Minutes from the 1 December 2006 meeting were approved as written.

3. Rita Alevriadou informed the committee of the recommendations from the Course Proposal Subcommittee.
3.1. The subcommittee recommended that the course proposals for AV 520, ECE 261, ECE 858, MSE 649, and WE 695 be approved.
   3.1.1. The comment was made that in the future it would be a good idea that when a course from a program other than the program making the course proposal is added to the prerequisites that concurrence be sought from the offering program.
   3.1.2. There being no further discussion Rita Alevriadou made a motion that these course requests be approved. Rob Wagoner seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.
3.2. The subcommittee recommended that all of the new Biomedical courses, 202, 204, 302, 303, 311, 321, 331, 341, 351, 361, 401, 402, 403, 481, 481.01, 481.02, and 481.03 be approved.
   3.2.1. The question was raised as to why the numbers for the courses are low. The reply was that BME decided that 100 level courses were for freshmen, 200 were for sophomores, 300 were for juniors, and 400 were for seniors. The comment was made that if BME decided
to make BME 202 a service course that due to its number it may be hard for other departments to accept it as a technical elective.

3.2.2. The question was raised as to whether concurrences have been requested for any of these courses. The reply was no and that the reason was that the courses were part of the BME BS Degree Proposal and that all of the department chairs knew about the proposal.

3.2.3. It was decided that a vote on BME’s new course requests would wait until their degree proposal had been voted on.

4. Members of Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee B stated that while all of their initial concerns about the proposal had been answered that they would like Bob Gustafson to review BME’s revised enrollment management plan and admission process and let the subcommittee know if it is acceptable. Members of the subcommittee are also concerned about the lack of concurrences for the course requests and the lack of a Standard for Academic Progress Policy. The floor was opened for discussion.

4.1. Bob Gustafson agreed to review BME’s revised enrollment management plan and admission process and let the subcommittee know if it is acceptable.

4.2. It was decided that BME’s Standard for Academic Progress Policy did not need to be part of the proposal and could be created at a later date if BME felt one was necessary.

4.3. Rich Hart stated that BME would seek the necessary concurrences for the new course requests and provide them to the Course Request Subcommittee.

4.4. Subcommittee B was requested, if at all possible, to present a report and a detailed motion on BME’s proposal at the committee’s next meeting.

5. Due to time limitations it was decided to defer to the committee’s next meeting the proposal to add CSE 214 to the Engineering Core.

6. The committee was given a copy of the e-mail message (attached) the committee secretary received from Mike Moran reference the status of the two curriculum proposals Subcommittee A is reviewing.

6.1. BSEnvE proposal: A revised proposal just reached the subcommittee. Mike has asked subcommittee members to take a look at it and respond with comments in a couple weeks.

6.2. Aviation proposal: Based on subcommittee activity over the quarter break, a slightly revised proposal was prepared by Aviation. Review of the revised proposal indicated that some areas that need clarification and/or rethinking. Mike has met with a group from Aviation on to discuss what is needed to go forward. A further revision is expected in a couple weeks.
7. The committee chair expressed his desire, that if at all possible, for Subcommittee A to present a report and a detailed motion on Environmental’s proposal at the committee’s next meeting.

8. Members of Subcommittee B stated that no progress had been made on Aviation’s MS in Air Transportation Systems Proposal as it has only recently been received.

9. Rob Wagoner presented the proposed MSE Standards of Academic Performance Policy (attached). This policy is being recommended for approval by the college’s ASAP committee. The floor was opened for discussion.
   9.1. Dave Tomasko informed the committee that Pam Hussen feels that this policy should not be approved at this time but that it should be included with all of the other unapproved policies when they are brought forward for approval.
   9.2. The question was asked as to what programs do about academic performance if they do not have a policy. The response was that they use the university’s policy. The problem with using the university’s policy is that students get into severe academic problems before any action can be taken. It is better to have a program policy so that action can be taken before a student gets into severe academic problems.
   9.3. Rob Wagoner made a motion that MSE’s Standards of Academic Performance Policy be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 12 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed.

10. Rob Wagoner presented a report from the CCAA/ASAP Ad-hoc Subcommittee (attached). Rob informed the committee that the policy created by the subcommittee, while not making any substantial changes to how ASAP currently works, will formalize the process. If approved, the report will make ASAP a standing subcommittee of CCAA rather than a stand alone committee. The floor was opened for discussion.
   10.1. The comment was made that since the report was only e-mailed to the committee yesterday that there has not been enough time to review it.
   10.2. The comment was made that parts of the report do not accurately reflect the history of the ASAP Committee and are much too harsh on its previous activities.
   10.3. The comment was made that some of the proposed policies in the report are contrary to what at least one of the programs is currently doing.
   10.4. The recommendation was made and approved that committee members discuss the report with their program’s current ASAP Committee member and get any recommended changes to Rob Wagoner or Ed McCaul so that the report can be considered at the committee’s next meeting. The committee secretary was asked to send a list of all of the current ASAP Committee members to everyone on the committee.
11. Bob Gustafson reminded the committee about the university’s rules for final examinations which can be found on the Board of Trustees website. The pertinent rules are 3335-8-19 Course examinations and 3335-8-20 (attached). All courses, except for laboratory and seminar courses are required to have final exams. The exams are to be given on the day and time scheduled by the registrar’s office unless an exception has been approved. Committee members were requested to pass this information on to the faculty in their department as some instructors have not been adhering to these rules. The question was raised as to whether there had been any complaints about exams not being given. The response was that there have been complaints about exams not being given as well as exams being given before exam week.

12. Being out of time the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 AM.

C: College Faculty
CCAA File
E-mail Message from Mike Moran
Report from Curriculum Proposal Subcommittee A

Ed: As it is unlikely that I'll be able to attend the meeting this week, here is a brief status report.

1. BSEnvE proposal: As you know, a revised proposal just reached us. I have asked subcommittee members to take a look at it and respond with comments in a couple weeks.

2. AVIATION proposal. Based on subcommittee activity over the quarter break, a slightly revised proposal was prepared by AVIATION. Review of this indicated some areas that need clarification and/or rethinking. I met with a group from AVIATION yesterday to discuss what is needed to go forward. A further revision is expected in a couple weeks.

Note: I see that you have the AVIATION graduate program proposal on the agenda. In my discussions with the AVIATION group yesterday it became clear that they are rethinking some aspects of their overall approach to the ATS initiative. Accordingly, it might be best to hold off on final action on the graduate component while the undergraduate component is being finalized.

Best, Mike
The Department of Materials Science and Engineering (MSE) encourages strong academic performance by its undergraduate pre-major and major students. To this end, students are provided with regular information concerning their academic standing in the MSE Department. One means by which this is done is through the tracking of students' Special Action Probation (SAP) status. By tracking a student's SAP status, the student is given ample warning regarding the seriousness of his/her position and ensuring the continued quality of students graduating from the MSE program.

Definition of Abbreviations

The following terms are used in this document:

MSE: Materials Science and Engineering
OSU: The Ohio State University
USC: MSE Undergraduate Studies Committee
Student: Majors or Pre-Major in MSE
SAP: Special Action Probation
GPA: Grade Point Average
CPHR: Cumulative GPA of all graded courses taken at OSU (CPHR = Cumulative Point Hour Ratio)

DPHR: GPA for all graded MSE courses taken at OSU, including MSE 205. If a course is retaken, both grades are used in the computation. (DPHR = Department Point Hour Ratio)

SPHR: GPA for the following set of courses:
Math 151 (or 161)
Physics 131
Chemistry 121
MSE 205.
If MSE 205 is retaken, both grades will be included in the calculation. If other courses are retaken, only the most recent grade will be included in the calculation. (SPHR = Special Point Hour Ratio)

PPHR: GPA for the following set of courses for which the student has received graded credit at OSU:
Chemistry 121, 122, 123 and 125  
Engineering 181, 183, 185, 186, 187, H191, H192 and H193  
Engineering Graphics 167  
Mathematics 151x, 152x, 153x, 254x, 161x, 162x, and 263x  
Physics 131, 132, and 133  
Honors versions or approved substitutions of such courses are included in the PPHR calculation. (PPHR = Pre-Major Point Hour Ratio)

QPHR: GPA for all graded courses taken during a given quarter. (QPHR = Quarterly Point Hour Ratio)

**Notification of Policies**

A copy of this statement is made available on the departmental web page.

**Definition of Good Standing for MSE Majors**

A student is in good standing as a Materials Science and Engineering major (program number 281) if the following two conditions are met:

1. A cumulative university GPA (CPHR) of 2.0 or greater is attained for all graded courses taken at OSU.

2. A GPA for all MSE courses taken (DPHR = Departmental Point Hour Ratio) of 2.0 or greater is attained. The classes included in this DPHR are all graded MSE courses taken, including MSE 205. Technical elective courses outside of MSE are not included in the DPHR. If a student retakes a course included in the DPHR, both grades will be used in the DPHR calculation.

**Definition of Good Standing for MSE Pre-Majors**

A student is in good academic standing as a Materials Science and Engineering pre-major (program 840/281) if all of the following conditions are met:

1. A QPHR of 2.0 or higher is achieved during that quarter.

2. A CPHR of 2.0 or higher is achieved during that quarter.

3. A PPHR of 2.0 or higher is achieved during that quarter.

4. Satisfactory progress is made toward becoming a Major in MSE, as determined by the Undergraduate Studies Committee (USC).

**Normal Admission to the MSE Major**
Normal admission to the MSE major requires an SPHR of 2.0 or greater and a DPHR of 2.0 or greater.

**Admission to the MSE Major on SAP**

Students who apply to the MSE major but who fail to meet the normal admission requirement as defined above may be permitted to enroll in the major under SAP only if approved in writing by the department's Undergraduate Studies Committee (USC).

**SAP for MSE Students (Majors and Pre-Majors)**

A student in MSE is either in good standing (as defined above) or is on SAP.

A student in MSE who is in good standing (as defined above) is removed from SAP or continues in good standing.

A student in MSE who is not in good standing (as defined above) is placed on SAP, continues on SAP, or is dismissed from the department, college, or university.

A student in MSE may also be placed on SAP if it is determined by the Undergraduate Studies Committee that there is a lack of progress towards a degree in the department.

A Major in MSE who has met SAP conditions for continued enrollment, but is not in good standing within the department (as defined above) may continue on SAP, up to a maximum of four quarters.

A Pre-Major in MSE who is not in good standing within the department (as defined above) may continue on SAP, up to a maximum of two quarters. A Pre-Major who is not in good standing within the department (as defined above) after two quarters on SAP is eligible for dismissal from the department, as determined by the USC.

A Major in MSE who is currently on SAP and who has not met the conditions of SAP is eligible for dismissal from the department, as determined by the USC. Dismissal from the department is for a minimum period of one calendar year (4 academic quarters) at which time the student may petition in writing for reinstatement to the department. Such petitions will be considered by the USC.

A Major in MSE who is not in good standing (as defined above) after four quarters on SAP is eligible for dismissal from the department, as determined by the USC. Dismissal from the department is for a minimum period of one calendar year (4 academic quarters) at which time the student may petition in writing for reinstatement to the department. Such petitions will be considered by the USC.

**Conditions for Continued Enrollment on SAP for MSE Majors**
A Major in MSE on SAP is expected to meet all of the conditions set forth by the USC. The standard conditions of continued enrollment on SAP include:

1. MSE deficiency points (based on the DPHR) must be reduced each quarter of enrollment at OSU. If two or more MSE courses are taken, deficiency points must be reduced by 5 or more each quarter. If only one MSE course is taken, deficiency points must be reduced by 3 or more each quarter.

2. A DPHR of 2.0 or greater must be achieved no later than four quarters of enrollment after SAP is instituted.

3. No “W’s” or “I’s” ("Withdrawals" or "Incompletes") may be accrued without the written consent of the MSE Undergraduate Advisor.

4. A QPHR of 2.0 or above must be maintained each quarter.

Other SAP conditions applicable to a specific student may be imposed by the USC. The letter of notification (described below) will clearly specify all such conditions.

*All students on SAP are urged to meet with the MSE Undergraduate Academic Advisor and their Faculty Advisor during the first two weeks of each quarter.*

**Quarterly Actions on Special Action Probation – Majors and Pre-Majors**

At the end of each quarter, the records of those students who are on SAP will be reviewed by the USC in order to make one of the following determinations:

1. A student who attains good standing (as defined above) will be removed from SAP.

2. A Major in MSE who has met SAP conditions for continued enrollment, but is not in good standing within the department (as defined above) may continue on SAP, up to a maximum of four quarters.

3. A student who is currently on SAP and who has not met the conditions of SAP is eligible for dismissal from the department, as determined by the USC.

4. A student who is not in good standing (as defined above) after four quarters on SAP (Majors) or two quarters (Pre-Majors) is eligible for dismissal from the department, as determined by the USC.

Dismissal from the department is for a minimum period of one calendar year (4 academic quarters) at which time the student may petition in writing for reinstatement to the department. Such petitions will be considered by the USC.

**SAP Notification and Appeals Procedures**
The following procedures regarding determination of status, notification, and appeals will be followed:

1. At the end of each quarter, the records of those students who are not in good standing will be reviewed by the USC in order to determine the appropriate action(s).

2. Communications with students regarding SAP, dismissal, reinstatement, or related matters will be sent by a letter to the student’s home address of record or an e-mail message to the university e-mail address on record. Non-receipt of such letter or e-mail by a student does not change the determination of his or her status (see item 3, below).

3. Communications as described above may occasionally be unavoidably delayed or may be undelivered for various reasons. It is therefore the responsibility of each student who is not in good standing to contact the MSE Undergraduate Advisor before the first day of the quarter to determine his or her standing.

4. Letters for students placed on SAP will clearly outline the conditions and terms of SAP. Copies of this letter will be sent to the College Office and placed in the student's department file.

5. Students allowed continued enrollment on SAP will be notified and the terms of SAP will be clearly outlined. Copies of this letter will be sent to the College Office and placed in the student's department file.

6. Students dismissed from the department will be notified of the conditions under which reinstatement may be pursued. The following procedures will be followed:
   - All MSE courses will be removed from the student's upcoming quarter schedule.
   - Instructors of MSE courses will be notified that dismissed students may not enroll in MSE courses.
   - The student will be removed from all departmental rosters.
   - The student's major will be reassigned as "Engineering Re-exploring (840/300)" to the College of Engineering College Office.
   - Copies of the dismissal letter will be sent to the College Office and placed in the student's department file.

7. Students returned to good standing (as defined above) will be notified by letter that this action has taken place and copies of the letter will be sent to the College Office and placed in the student's department file.
8. Students may appeal any action related to SAP by written petition to the MSE
USC. Students should confer with the MSE Undergraduate Advisor before preparing
such a petition. After such an appeal has been decided, students may appeal further to
the College committee on Academic Standards and Progress.
Draft Final Report of the CCAA/ASAP Ad-hoc Subcommittee

Rob Wagoner – Chair
Ed McCaul - Secretary
Dave Tomasko
Linda Wang
Gary Kinzel
Ruby Smith
Pam Hussen
Chuck Klein
Bob Gustafson

This report consists of a motion to CCAA and background information.

Moved:

1. That CCAA form a standing subcommittee called the Academic and Standards and Performance Subcommittee (ASAP),

2. that the attached policies be approved by CCAA for the operation of ASAP, and

3. that the current roster and terms of members of the old ASAP committee be continued in the newly-formed ASAP Subcommittee.

Background:

The ad-hoc subcommittee determined that the current ASAP committee is a standing committee of the College of Engineering that has existed, under various names, since at least the 1980’s and possibly longer. Its purpose has been to take actions regarding academic warning, probation, and dismissal. It may have at some time had a role in enrollment management, but not currently. In recent years it has reviewed and carried out actions related to Special Action Probation (SAP) and Academic Probation.

The operational policies and even the existence of the current ASAP have apparently never been approved by CCAA or by the faculty of the College of Engineering. Minutes were on some occasions taken and recorded; on other occasions apparently not. It is unclear if such minutes were approved or disseminated outside of the committee. There are only two instances found in CCAA minutes of ASAP operations being reviewed by CCAA: the SAP policies of two departments were approved by CCAA in the early 2000’s.

The College of Engineering Pattern of Administration states that CCAA has responsibility for “educational and academic policies of the College.” It is therefore
appropriate that ASAP should be formed as a subcommittee of CCAA and that its establishment and operational policies should be approved by CCAA. Since some of ASAP’s operation involves blanket approval of actions consistent with approved departmental SAP policies, those policies should also be approved by CCAA.

The proposed operational policies (attached) reflect the current operation of ASAP. Changes, such as required minute-taking, are clarifications deemed necessary by the ad-hoc subcommittee.

att: Operating Policy for the Standing Academic Standards and Progress Subcommittee (ASAP) of CCAA

Items to refer to the ASAP Subcommittee for discussion and future action
Operating Policy for the Standing Academic Standards and Progress Subcommittee (ASAP) of CCAA

January 24, 2007

1.0 History:

The Academic Standards and Progress Subcommittee (ASAP) evolved from a committee established in approximately 1990 to monitor policies established and issues arising as the college and departments began to manage enrollments. The subcommittee was established by the Engineering College Dean.

2.0 Position in College:

ASAP is a standing subcommittee of CCAA. Conforming with the College of Engineering’s Pattern of Administration, at least one member of ASAP must be a CCAA member.

3.0 Duties:

ASAP has the responsibility to recommend policies and rules relative to academic standards controlling warning, probation, and dismissal of undergraduate students in the Engineering College, to implement appropriate actions in these areas, and to monitor the progress of students in academic difficulty. ASAP does not consider or regulate program admission requirements, except as they interact with warning, probation, and dismissal. Specific duties include:

3.1 Develop, update, and act upon policies (to be approved by CCAA) for students being given an academic warning, being placed on probation, or being dismissed from the College

3.2 Review policies of individual departments regarding probation and dismissals and recommend approval of such policies to CCAA

3.3 Review and approve departmental/programmatic recommendations ensuring compliance with their approved departmental/programmatic policies. While the departmental/programmatic policy and recommendations should always be strongly considered, the voting subcommittee has the authority to decide the final outcome in all cases.

3.4 Recommend actions regarding undecided pre-major students.

3.5 Recommend to CCAA such actions, policies, or procedures that may reduce the number of students in academic difficulty.

4.0 Membership:

4.1 Each undergraduate program in the College shall recommend, for appointment by the dean, a faculty member to represent their program on ASAP. The designated
A faculty member will generally be the Undergraduate Program Chair. When a department has multiple programs, different programs may be represented by the same faculty member if they so choose; however, that faculty member will be allowed only one vote.

4.2 Undergraduate Program Advisors are asked to attend meetings of the subcommittee and have all privileges of the meeting except the vote. However, one Undergraduate Program Advisor, designated by the advisors annually shall have voting rights on ASAP.

4.3 A student member shall be appointed by the dean. The student member may vote on all policy issues but not on actions regarding the status of individual students. The term of the student member would normally be one year; however, their membership can be renewed for additional years if both the student and subcommittee agree.

4.4 The Minority Engineering Program shall designate a member with voting rights.

4.5 The Women in Engineering Program shall recommend, for appointment by the dean, a member with voting rights.

4.6 The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education and Student Services shall serve as an Ex-Officio, non-voting member of ASAP.

4.7 A College staff member who monitors student status shall serve as an Ex-Officio member with voting rights. This member will be appointed by the Dean of the College of Engineering.

4.8 Departments/programs may delegate an alternative voting member for an absent member. Such delegation must be made in writing prior to the ASAP meeting.

4.9 At least one member of the ASAP subcommittee must be a member of CCAA.

5.0 Officers:

5.1 During the spring quarter of each year, the subcommittee shall elect a new Chair for the following year from the continuing members of the subcommittee. No individual may serve as Chair of ASAP for more than three consecutive one-year terms. The College Staff representative who monitors student status shall serve as the Secretary of the subcommittee.

6.0 Meetings:

6.1 The subcommittee shall meet at least once each quarter, normally on the Thursday following graduation. Other meetings may be called by the Chair if policy issues arise that cannot be handled during the time of the regular quarterly meeting.

6.2 Minutes will be recorded for each of the meetings. Normally, the minutes will be recorded by the Secretary. The minutes shall be circulated prior to the next meeting and a corrected minutes approved at the next meeting. Consistent with university and FERPA regulations, the minutes should include:

6.2.1 A list of those attending the meeting
6.2.2 A record of all motions and their disposition
6.2.3 Any policy documents that were distributed at the meeting
6.2.4 Any discussion of principles or policies that lead to a vote

6.3 The College will maintain a repository to archive the meeting minutes and the
detailed spreadsheets that are submitted by programs to the ASAP
Subcommittee summarizing the pertinent information on each case for which
action was taken. The repository will be available to members of the ASAP
Subcommittee.

6.4 For voting purposes, a quorum of the ASAP Subcommittee is 50 percent plus 1
of the voting members.

7.0 Operational Definitions:

7.1 Department Dismissal (DD). Department dismissal means that the
student will not be allowed to enroll in a given program or in any
program-specific course unless it is required by their new major.
A department or program may recommend departmental dismissal based on that
department’s or program’s SAP policy. No student can be dismissed from a department
unless he or she is already on probation. Departments (or programs) may specify in
their policy the number of times that a student may be dismissed and reinstated to their
programs. Department/program dismissal is authorized under the SAP Rules of the
University [3335-9-25(B)].

7.2 College Dismissal (CD). College dismissal means that the student will
not be allowed to enroll in any program in the College of Engineering
without submitting a petition for reinstatement to the College or in any
course that is open to only engineering students in the College of
Engineering unless required by their new major.
The subcommittee may college dismiss a student if it determines that the student:
   7.2.1 is departmentally dismissed and has a cumulative gpa less
   than 2.0, or
   7.2.2 is unlikely to succeed in any program in the college, or
   7.2.3 is in the Re-Exploration or Engineering Undecided program
   and fails to meet the terms of their probation, or
   7.2.4 has shown a lack of progress by failing to take any
   engineering core, select core, or major courses for their past
   three quarters of enrollment or more.

No student can be dismissed from the college unless he or she is already on probation.
No student may be reinstated more than two times in the College. College dismissal is
authorized under the SAP Rules of the University [3335-9-25(B)].

7.3 Academic Dismissal (AD). Academic dismissal is defined by University
Students who do not meet university academic standards will be dismissed (AD) from
the University. No student can be dismissed from the University unless he or she is
already on probation. Students who have been dismissed cannot enroll in any courses
taught at the University. This action is taken under University Rule 3335-9-26.
8.0 ASAP Subcommittee Operations:

8.1 All ASAP college-wide operational policies must be approved by CCAA and will to be made public by being placed in the CCAA Handbook and possibly on a web site. 
8.2 Before taking effect, all departmental/program policies must be approved by CCAA following a review and recommendation from ASAP. These policies will be made public by being placed in the CCAA handbook and on the appropriate web page. Departments may request CCAA consideration of proposed policies whether they are recommended for approval by ASAP or not.
8.3 If a program elects not to participate in actions under Special Action Probation [University Rule 3335-9-25(B)], only the academic policy of the University will apply (University Rule 3335-9-26).
8.4 If a conflict arises between Departmental and ASAP policies, ASAP policies shall prevail.
8.5 ASAP takes final action on all probation and dismissal recommendations in the College of Engineering, including CD and DD. Final action means that the department/program may not deviate from the ASAP decision with one narrow exception. When the outcome of a case that was recommended and approved based on objective departmental standards (e.g. grades, gpa) would be changed by new objective information (e.g., new grade, gpa), the department may revise the outcome and notify ASAP (Chair or Secretary) accordingly. The secretary will record the change and will report it as part of the Minutes. This exception does not apply to other new, non-grade based information such as personal or health updates.
8.6 In practice, departmental recommendations consistent with the approved objective (i.e. grade-based) policies for that program will normally not be discussed by ASAP before acting, but will simply be approved unless a subcommittee member, the department/program involved, or the student in question requests a discussion. Departments / Programs must certify that such cases are consistent with their and the College’s published, objective policies.
8.7 ASAP discusses departmental recommendations before acting on them if:
8.7.1 The objective standards in the approved department policy statement are contrary to, are ambiguous about, or do not address the action proposed,
8.7.2 The proposed action is based on subjective standards (i.e. “lack of progress”),
8.7.3 The program requests a review,
8.7.4 A member of the ASAP Subcommittee or CCAA committee requests a review,
8.7.5 A student appeals a previous decision (after first appealing to the program), or
8.7.6 The department policy is unapproved or out-of-date.
8.8 Reports by the ASAP chair or designee will be made to CCAA of usual issues or proposed policy changes.
8.9 The ASAP Subcommittee does not consider or regulate program admission or reinstatement requirements, except as they interact with SAP.
8.10 Notification of a student of SAP actions will be consistent with OSU notification procedures.
8.11 The chair of the ASAP Subcommittee (or, if unavailable, the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education and Student Services) can, in extraordinary circumstances, make decisions on behalf of ASAP concerning dismissals if the issue cannot be handled during the time of the regularly scheduled quarterly meeting. If the chair takes such action, the chair must make a report to the full subcommittee at the subcommittee’s next meeting, and the action must be recorded in the minutes.

Items to be referred to ASAP for discussion and potential recommendations to CCAA

- Shall reinstatements be approved by ASAP or be handled exclusively by programs?

- Shall all department dismissals also be college dismissals? (Pre-majors? Majors?)

- Shall programs be permitted to treat students leaving a major (but facing a departmental dismissal) differently from one another?

- In view of privacy concerns, shall ASAP continue to have student members?
University Rules on Final Examinations

3335-8-19 Course examinations.
At the close of each course as defined in rule 3335-8-01 of the Administrative Code, an examination will be given on the student's capabilities relative to the stated course objectives, the method of examining to be determined by the instructor or supervisor of the course. Examinations in laboratory and seminar courses shall be optional with the instructor concerned. (B/T 7/9/2004)

3335-8-20 Schedules for final examinations.
(A) Examinations for classes taught on the regional campuses and for classes whose enrollment is exclusively of students registered in the colleges of dentistry, law, medicine, optometry, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine will be scheduled by the offices of the regional campuses and of the colleges respectively. All examination schedules prepared outside the office of the university registrar shall, before publication, be cleared with the office of the university registrar which shall have the power to resolve all conflicts.

(B) All other final examinations shall be centrally scheduled by the office of the university registrar. The official examination schedules shall be strictly adhered to by all instructors. Any deviation must first be approved by the appropriate university official (department chair, regional campus dean and director, or college dean) in consultation with the office of the university registrar, which shall have the power to resolve all conflicts. Final grades for graduating students must be submitted electronically to the office of the university registrar by the deadlines established by that office.

(C) In performing its scheduling function the office of the university registrar shall limit individual examinations to two-hour duration and the total examination period to no more than five days. (B/T 8/1/97, B/T 12/5/2003, B/T 7/9/2004, B/T 12/2/2005)