

Proposal: Upon reconsideration (see note on history below), the DLel committee believes that SR 5.1.8.1 should be changed.

Current Wording:

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]

Proposed Wording:

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~~ the Registrar who shall remove the students from the class roll and ~~notify the Registrar that the student has been removed from the class roll. The Registrar will~~ who shall 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]

Rationale: In a DL context, it's difficult to know how to identify when "the first two class periods" end. 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).

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). The proposal returned to SC on November 19, 2018 with a proposal to delete the rule ([agenda](#)) on the basis that it had no useful purpose.