Five-Year Review – Academic Regulations Committee

Do the Standing Rules clearly reflect the function & composition of this committee?

The Standing Rules for the Academic Regulations Committee would benefit from revision. The current description could be clarified to better describe the purview and purpose of the ARC, and to remove some activities that are not currently relevant. For example, the current description places a key focus on "improving the evaluation of scholastic performance of students" which is not really the goal of the ARC or of the Academic Regulations.

Have the committee’s actions/function, as reported in the annual reports and based on consultation with the current chair and committee, been consistent with their Standing Rules?

In the past three years the ARC has primarily focused on making recommendations in response to questions and/or requests for revision of academic regulations to address problems that have emerged. The ARC has not focused on a full "study of the effect of current ... regulations" as listed in the Standing Rules. In sum, the ARC has been primarily responsive, and less pro-active in review/revision of the AR's. Presently, the ARC is beginning discussion about inconsistencies in the regulations and language used therein. The annual reports do a good job of leaving a trail of actions and discussions to assist with continuity and history.

Do the annual reports provide a memory of the issues this committee addressed, their activities and any outcomes?

The annual reports do a good job of leaving a trail of actions and discussions to assist with continuity and history.

What has been the role/benefit of the student members?

We have not been successful in having student members participate on the ARC. We would welcome the perspective of students in the discussion.

What connection is there to the University’s strategic plan? How does the committee add value to the University?

The Academic Regulations are related to the strategic plan in that they are designed to assist advisors, faculty, and the registrar's office to support student achievement of their educational goals. We have recognized that in some situations the systems (such as MyDegrees) that are in place confound opportunities for out-of-the-box thinking/inter-disciplinary activities, such as dual degrees and the like.

The ARC makes a concrete contribution to university and faculty governance by convening member faculty and the Registrar in meaningful conversation and problem solving around the topics covered by the AR's. I have found that the
current and former Registrar have been very interested in discussing situations where the AR's seem to lead to inequitable outcomes for students. They have welcomed the recommendations of the ARC and sought guidance for the Registrar's Office through Academic Regulations revisions. In turn, the Registrar has provided input to proposed changes in the AR's that may lead to problems for students, or problems in the MyDegrees program related to tracking student progress toward graduation. In sum, the ARC seems an example of a committee whose charge is ideally situated for shared governance.

If the chair believes the committee does not add value, please explain and address the question as to whether the committee should continue to exist.

As above; all is well.

Does this committee’s work enhance OSU’s commitment to diversity? If so, how?

The Academic Regulations are designed to outline common understandings of the principles and procedures for navigating certain processes related to the attainment of a degree. As a result, the ARC enhances OSU's commitment to diversity as it deliberates about the impacts of current and proposed regulations, with the goals of communicating the AR's with clarity and minimizing current or potential inequities.