Academic Standards Committee

Minutes of 25 January 2011 Meeting

Bellin Gallery – Student Center

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.

Present:
University Deans – M. Horan (A & S), M. P. Bigley (SEPS); S. Braverman (Business)
Arts and Sciences – N. Castañeda (Math), J. Geller (English)(Chair), F. Latour (Math), K. McGrath (History), R. Schwell (Math)
Business – M. McCarthy (Accounting); C. Crespi (Accounting)
Education and Professional Studies – C. Tripodina (Nursing)
Engineering and Technology – J. Mulrooney (Biomolecular Science)
Registrar – S. Petrosino
Admissions – L. Hall
Student Affairs – R. Hernandez

I. Motion: Approval of November minutes
M. Horan
Second: F. Latour
Vote: passed unanimously

II. Requisite, Required, and Related Requirements for Programs
1. J. Mulrooney presented the report from the subcommittee formed to address the lack of consistency in how minimum grades for required courses and related requirements are interpreted by different departments and programs. The subcommittee met over the winter break to draft consistent language.

2. The committee proposed the use of the following terms:
   1. Requisite: those courses typically in the major or minor, typically offered by the department owning the major; minimum grade of C- required
   2. Required: those courses typically in the major or minor, but typically offered by another department; minimum grade of C- required
   3. Related: those courses not typically in the major or minor but required for the major or minor; no minimum grade required

3. J. Mulrooney and M.P. Bigley both emphasized that this was not intended as a change in the curriculum. It does not impact those programs that maintain a higher minimum grade, and each department would need to make choices for their own curriculum. F. Latour suggested that this be explicitly stated in the catalogue.

4. J. Mulrooney also discussed changing the catalogue language to address double-counting and graduation standards. He notes that only requisite courses could double-count for general education.
5. S. Braverman asked about how this would affect the School of Business because of their 50% residency requirement. J. Mulrooney noted that each department would need to define its own major and its requirements.

6. R. Schwell and J. Geller asked about how departments would make changes to these categories later. M.P. Bigley and J. Mulrooney said that it would be through Academic Standards.

7. There was a discussion of how to move forward. A letter will be sent to departments requesting that they note their curriculum categories in time for the new catalog in March. These will then be reviewed by the ad hoc subcommittee to make sure there are no conflicts between programs or need for greater clarification. These would then be forwarded to S. Petrosino for formatting into CAPP. S. Petrosino and Nancy Perreault were added to the subcommittee for this purpose.

8. **Motion: Approval of subcommittee report**
   
   M.P. Bigley  
   Second: M. Horan  
   Passed: 14 yeas, 0 nays, 1 abstention (S. Braverman)

**III. Grade Change Appeals Policy**

1. F. Latour discussed the report by the ad hoc subcommittee formed to address these issues over the winter break. He discussed the concerns on the lack of clarity for the policy, especially in terms of the steps in the process for students. The subcommittee worked to draft a new statement that would outline the different parts of the process. The committee then discussed each step in the process.

2. For the second step, J. Geller asked about whether or not the chair would just meet with the instructor or grade the student’s work. F. Latour emphasized that this policy would not apply to cases of academic misconduct. He also said that the chair would need to do whatever was necessary to evaluate the appeal. He also emphasized that at any stage until the end, the decision is just a suggestion. The permission of the instructor is still needed to change the grade formally. It was suggested that the language in this regard (like in 2c) be changed from “written decision” to “written opinion.”

3. S. Braverman asked about why the inclusion of “if the instructor has left the university” clause. J. Mulrooney noted the difficulty he has had in contacting former instructors in the past. S. Braverman suggested the addition of language that would allow chairs to try to contact former employees so as not an automatic out.

4. R. Schwell asked about the deadlines in regard to instructors on sabbatical, while S. Braverman asked about incompletes. F. Latour reported that the policy would cover these situations, as the student would just need to note this as the reason that they did not meet with the instructor in the 2 week timeframe.

5. M.P. Bigley asked about the lack of a timeframe for forwarding the appeal to the next level. She suggested adding the word, “immediately.” J. Geller
noted the need to define this term. It was suggested that “within 3 business days” be added.

6. M.P. Bigley noted that the 2\textsuperscript{nd} week of the semester will probably be incorrectly assumed to be the 2\textsuperscript{nd} week of classes by students. It was suggested that this be changed to reflect this. She also suggested that it be changed to the end of add/drop so that students could still register for courses depending on the outcome. It was noted that this would limit the time for students to talk with instructors.

7. S. Braverman asked about students in winter session in which grades are not posted before the 2\textsuperscript{nd} week of spring classes. S. Petrosino suggested that the policy should only apply to regular semesters. F. Latour also noted that students could note it as the reason why they did not meet within the 2 weeks.

8. F. Latour raised the issue of the current policy requiring students to make 5 copies for the Grade Appeals Committee. In the past, it was included because it was seen as too burdensome to make the members of the Grade Appeals Committee make these copies. It is suggested that this be changed to reflect current practice in which the copy from the dean’s office is forwarded to the Grade Appeals Committee.

9. M.P. Bigley suggested clearer language that the chair, dean, or Grade Appeals Committee can request more documentation or clarification from the instructor or the student.

10. There was a discussion of the different names for the Grade Appeals Review Board. The committee decided that it should be called just the Grade Appeals Committee.

11. M. Horan raised the issue of a statement that changes could not take place after graduation. S. Petrosino noted the real need for such a statement.

12. The committee decided to have the ad hoc subcommittee meet again before the next meeting in order to make changes and further clarifications. They will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

K. McGrath
Secretary