

Minutes
Undergraduate Academic Affairs Subcommittee
December 9, 2015

Members in Attendance: M. Allen, D. Barbeau, G. Barker, C. Boyd, J. Burwinkle, R. Cole, J. Langan, S. Naeger, K. Ravindra, K. Thatcher, N. Westhus.

Call to Order: Dr. Dorsey called the meeting to order at 8:35am.

Approval of Minutes from the November 11, 2015 Subcommittee Meeting: Motion made by K. Thatcher to approve the November 11, 2015 meeting minutes and seconded by R. Cole – 10 approve, 2 abstain.

General Announcement

This is the last UAAC meeting of the semester - they start up again in February.

Academic Policies Update

Members received revised Undergraduate Policy Proposals based on feedback from the December 2, 2015 UAAC General Meeting. Note: there is one addition, an update on proposed language for the repeating courses policy.

Bereavement policy

Points of interest:

No additional edits, suggestions, revisions, to add to this policy.

Motion made by Joanne Langan to approve the Bereavement policy and seconded by Robert Cole – unanimous approval.

Final Examination Reschedule

Points of interest:

- The title now reads “Reschedule” instead of “Postponement”.
- Under Policy Purposes we still had postpone but it has been changed to “Rules for Rescheduling”.
- On the second sentence, can we change from “must be made two weeks...” to “must be made **at least** two weeks...”

Motion made by Robert Cole to approve the *Final Examination Reschedule* policy with the “must be made **at least** two weeks...” edit and seconded by Kathleen Thatcher – unanimous approval.

Grade Appeal

Points of interest:

- First sentence- changed “statute of limitations” to within one calendar year, which is our general timeline.
- Number four – Dr. Debie Lohe offered language for number four to represent the spirit of the assessment of academic performance: *The grade assigned results from different standards than the expectations for performance and evaluation outlined in the course syllabus.*

- Policy states all appeals must be completed within one calendar year. Would a school/college's policy trump that? Our policy says that the student has to start the appeal within one month of the assigned grade. In general University policy is that students have one year to appeal their grade. Generally speaking university policies are followed by all so students are not treated differently no matter where. Although in the absence of a consistent University policy and practice, grade appeal is not managed across colleges/schools consistently.
- One year grade appeal seems like a long time to initiate because if a student, waits for a full year and loses the appeal and has to wait a full year to re-take the course to get the grade they need to progress, they could be delayed in graduation. Proposed revised to complete within one calendar year with a shorter timeframe for initiating grade appeal. Or, initiate and completed within one calendar year. Concern will students understand that appealing a grade on day 363 will not be able to be completed by day 365.
- How is grade appeal managed if the grade is in the spring? Many faculty aren't on campus over the summer. JCSB allows students to appeal one month into the fall semester to appeal.
- Is it possible to change the term expectations in evaluation to criteria - criteria is what is used in a rubric. Expectation can be difficult to define because it could be course expectations or expectations of the course.
- Number 2 & 3 (twice in 3) - request to remove the term undergraduate and equivalent. Concern that the term equivalent implies that not all students are equal in the class. There are some graduate students who take undergraduate courses and they may erroneously believe that the policy doesn't apply to them. In addition, we do not use the undergraduate term in any other areas, so no need here given it's in the undergraduate catalog. The intention is that all students taking the class are evaluated the same.
- Number 3 -I am hearing the completed term we need to alter, possibly to initiate.
- Recommendation to work on a separate policy that addresses the non-assignment of grade. This would include a non-assignment of grade at midterm which is also really difficult for many students on campus from a progression viewpoint. This has been raised by faculty, staff and students in the past. Reminder that midterm grades are required for undergrad students.
- Recommendation: As far as the assignment of a grade, isn't there something in the faculty manual about the responsibilities of a faculty member? Isn't that where we should address that issue? Is it clear or not in their about the responsibilities of a faculty member to assign a grade - it may merely implied.
- In summary:
 - All appeals must be initiated within six months of the grade assignment and completed within one calendar year.
 - Add #4 language: *The grade assigned results from different standards than the expectations for performance and evaluation outlined in the course syllabus.*
 - Remove the term undergraduate and equivalent in #2 & 3.
 - This policy is not addressing midterm grades, so the term final should be in front of the very first word to clarify.

- Follow-up questions:
 - Can we identify the policy that indicates that all undergraduate students must receive a midterm grade?
 - Can midterm grades be changed by the instructor?

Repeating courses

Points of interest:

- This policy was adopted last year and it has been very successful.
- In the middle of the policy box statement, in bold and underlined there is a highlighted addition with regard to courses that may be repeated for credit. What we found was that there were some issues with repeating a course when the course was designed to be repeated. Unless identified the new grade replaced the old grade, but each time the student took the course it was a different experience. It was designed so each time a student takes the course, they are supposed to get credit and a new grade every time you take that course for some courses (e.g., a student has to take a special topics class six times for the major - it is a different class technically each time).
- How do we approach retaking a course if the student failed as a consequence of academic dishonesty? The question is if a student received a lower grade as a result of an academic integrity sanction, there is nothing in this policy that prohibits them from taking the course again and fixing that. So if they got an F in the course because they whatever, based on the way it sounds, they can take the course and have that F removed from their GPA.
- If the student retakes the course and doesn't have an academic issue then they have learned and they have gained the content of the course. When we are talking about student learning, if the student put forth the right effort and demonstrates that they learned the content, then I think that is student success. I look at this more from a student learning perspective and if a student can demonstrate that they learned the content isn't that what we want. Continuing to "sanction" the student after they have successfully re-taken the course could keep them from being certified, prolong or keep them from graduating, etc. We are giving them the opportunity to move on.
- There is a TYPO in the middle of box, Note: should be whether and it says wether.

Motion made by Joanne Langan to approve the *Repeating Courses* policy with the with typographical correction and seconded by Robert Cole – unanimous approval.

Withdraw

Points of interest:

- We need to work toward a consistent use of the term across campus. We use the term in 3 different ways:
 - withdraw from *a course*;
 - withdraw from *a semester*;
 - withdraw from *the University*.

- Perhaps clarity in use across campus is to use the qualifiers noted above. After additional exploration, withdraw is used widely across our peer institutions and we haven't found a substitute for the term.
- Another recommendation is to automatically withdraw a student from the University if not enrolled by the end of the 1st 2 weeks of classes (end of drop/add period), before census, or by the end of the 1st 3 weeks before dropped for financial arrangements. In this case of withdraw it identifies the active or inactive status of a student – a student is either enrolled or unenrolled. In addition, develop a short re-admission form for students in good standing who withdraw from the University. Current process is that students have two unenrolled semesters (fall/spring) prior to automatic withdraw from the University. Re-admit requires full admission process at this time.
- The current use of withdraw is very cumbersome – can we use administrative withdraw when a student doesn't apply for withdrawal? This phrase is currently used as another descriptor of withdraw.
- Another option to withdraw is an LOA.
- Is it possible to not immediately separate a student from the university after withdraw from classes for that semester for whatever reason; provide another window before they are separated entirely from the University? Is there some kind of interim status where you are withdrawn from class; put into an inactive state and then become withdrawn from the university at mid-term or end of term. I'm not sure how this works relative to housing given a student wouldn't be enrolled and how financial aid and SAP would be impacted by this limbo period.
- How does an administrative withdraw from course or University apply to students who have accommodations? There are very specific parameters about absence being an accommodation. Recommendation is to contact Disability Services to gain additional clarity.

Adjourn 10:00