

Proposal: Upon reconsideration (see note on history below), the DLel committee believes that SR 5.1.8.1 does not serve a useful purpose and should be deleted.

Rationale: The current rule allows for instructors to remove students from class who do not attend the “the first two class periods of a course”.

5.1.8.1 Unilateral Removal for Failure to Attend First Two Class Periods

Students who miss the first two class periods of a course without notifying the department of their intention to attend may be reported by the department to the dean who shall remove the students from the class role and notify the Registrar that the student has been removed from the class roll. The Registrar will inform such students that they have been removed. The students will have no record of the class appear on their transcripts. [US: 12/12/77; US: 9/20/93]

For many courses, if students miss “the first two class periods”, there isn’t enough time after that to add students to the class roll because the last day to add a class has already passed. Also, in a DL context, it’s difficult to know how to identify when “the first two class periods” end.

We looked at defining the time differently as follows:

5.1.8.1 Unilateral Removal for Failure to ~~Attend First Two Class Periods~~ a Course

~~Students who miss the first two class periods of a course without notifying the department of their intention to attend may be reported by the department~~ If from the first day of classes to the last day to add a class, inclusive, students neither show evidence of participation in the course nor notify the Instructor of Record of their intent to complete the course, the Instructor of Record may report these students to the dean who shall remove ~~the students~~ them from the class role and notify the Registrar that the ~~student has~~ students have been removed from the class ~~roll~~ roll. The Registrar will inform such students that they have been removed. The students will have no record of the class appear on their transcripts. [US: 12/12/77; US: 9/20/93]

However, while redefining the time helps address the DL issue, it still leaves no time to add students to fill otherwise empty seats. Also, the issue here really only affects face-to-face courses in classrooms that have a seating constraint (e.g., due to fire codes). It is not appropriate to remove a student in these cases and add other students (e.g., from a waitlist) because the expelled students may miss because of an excused absence. If so, the same seating constraints would not allow the student with excused absences to re-enroll, thus penalizing that student for an excused absence which is prohibited (SR 5.2.4.2).

It also seems inefficient and unnecessary to route the process through the dean since the dean exercises no discretion (i.e., the “shall remove” language).

Plus, we believe that students are increasingly aware of the need to attend class as a result of the new Title IV procedures.

For these reasons, we recommend deleting this rule (SR 5.1.8.1).

History: The Senate Council approved our proposal to change Senate Rule 5.1.8.1 (“Unilateral Removal for Failure to Attend First Two Class Periods”) at its October 17, 2016 meeting (agenda and minutes) but we pulled it and a bunch of other Senate Rule change proposals from that agenda for concerns about the other proposals. Given the delay, we brought it back again to SC for reconsideration in November 2017 (postponed from this SC agenda) where it was discussed and approved for a second time by SC (agenda and minutes). But it again didn't get on the Senate agenda, so we brought it back to SC for a third round of consideration in February 2018 (SC agenda and minutes) and action on it was postponed because of a seemingly related proposal (Title IV, early engagement policy) by Registrar Kim Taylor. The proposal returned to SC a fourth time at the May 14, 2018 meeting when the issue wasn't heard for a lack of time (agenda and minutes bottom of page 4).