Academic Standards Committee Meeting  
October 18, 2016  
Blue and White Room in the Student Center

Members in Attendance: Bartone, Michael; Bigley, Mary Pat; Boncoddo, Rebecca; Durant, Monique; Givens, Eugena; Hammad, Khaled; He, Fan; Heinly, Matthew; Marjani, Sadie; Moore, Edward; Mulrooney, James; Pesca, Carmela; Roth, Rick; Schnobrich-Davis, Julie; DeCarlo, Donna; Resetaritas, Paul; Hoffman, Nancy; Bielawa, Matthew

1. Meeting called to order at 3:07 p.m.

2. Approval of the minutes from April 19, 2016

New Business:

1. Three proposals from the School of Education and Professional Studies (SEPS) Central Teacher Education Committee (CTEC)

   a. Standards for Continuation

      1. Mary Pat explained at these are revisions of policies that they already have.
      2. Nancy Hoffman explained that these policy revisions are meant to make decisions and appeals more transparent. There are state and national provisions that control.
      3. Standards for continuation don’t change the basic rule; the wording simply makes it clearer.
      4. This wording also accommodates a change that was approved by the state legislature. This policy says that if you are denied admission based on lower GPA than required, this is how you appeal it, or if you are dismissed because of GPA, this is how you appeal. This has been through Carolyn Manion’s office and changes have been made based on that review.

         i. Question - Do we really track what students do at other schools? Answer - Yes, due to state requirements. So transcripts from other schools are used to calculate cumulative GPA

         ii. Question - While an appeal is pending, is the student removed from classes? It could take up to 30 days while appeal is being processed. Doesn’t that put the student in a bind for completing coursework while appeal is pending? Answer - We deal with the appeal expeditiously. But we can’t let the student work in the public schools while the appeal is pending. Also, we have proactively scheduled meetings in advance in case we need them, so we can deal with things in a timely fashion.

         iii. Question - Do we want to codify the process? Answer - No, we don’t want to do that. We can’t control when the student will appeal. If student is not allowed to continue they will be advised to speak with the SEPS counselor to review the policy.

         iv. Question - Do you have rubrics? Answer - Yes, there are sets of requirements.


2. Proposal to revise the current University Policy: Excused Absences for University-Sanctioned Events
a. **Excused absences for University-Sanctioned Events**

1. **Paul Resaritas** - The purpose of this draft language is to clarify existing language, which is shown in italics at the top of the draft page.
2. This is needed because of various examples (i.e., international travel and for factory visits). This language does not mandate that any professor accept the absence; it just suggests that faculty should accommodate the student’s absence. Other universities have policies similar to this one.
   i. **Question.** Do any other CSU school have a policy such as this one? **Answer** - No.
   ii. **Question** - What is the intent of Paragraph 6? Are you suggesting that a form be provided to the student to present to the professor? **Answer** - No form letter yet. But some sort of objective evidence to show that the student isn’t making it up.
   iii. **Question** - Point 3. Suggest the wording “Faculty members should provide timely opportunities for attendance at these events.” **Answer** - This would work. This policy is a suggestion, not a requirement.
   iv. **Question** – Point 3 regarding the opportunity to make up a similar experience. Suggestion: Change the wording from “with prior arrangement” to “with prior approval.”
   v. **Discussion.** Regarding Point 4 regarding excused absences.

3. **Motion with regard to point 3** – to insert the word “timely” opportunities. Unanimously approved.
4. **Motion with regard to point 4** - Strike the second sentence. Unanimously approved
5. **Motion to approve entire policy with changes as noted above.** The proposal is to amend bullet point Number 4 on the existing policy. Passed unanimously.

3. **Credit Hours Normalization Request for Construction Management.**

a. **Jim Mulrooney** - Total credit hours currently required is 130. We are trying to reduce credit requirement to 120. This would include the elimination of one (3 credit) required general education course. Discussion that this should go back to the schools for approval. After us, this goes to the Curriculum Committee.
   1. **Question.** Is this out of order - does this go to the Curriculum Committee first?
   2. **Question.** Do we want to give it a statement of support? Discussion. Julie mentioned that we meet next on November 22. Jim will see if he can submit the normalization request to the next Curriculum Committee meeting. We may have an email/expedited approval for this change.

b. Motion to send to curriculum committee before voting. Seconded. Approved unanimously.

c. We will put this issue on the agenda for our November 22 meeting.

4. Meeting adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Monique Durant