

1999-2000
FACULTY SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, March 9, 2000
Foothill Suite, University Union
3:00-5:00 p.m.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

HENRY A. BAMMAN
Professor of Education Emeritus
CSUS 1955-79

MARION M. LAMB
Professor of Business Administration Emeritus
CSUS 1951 - 1974

OPEN FORUM

CONSENT CALENDAR

**FS 00-9/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND
PHYSICAL EDUCATION**

The Faculty Senate receives the commendations and recommendations (Attachment A) of the Curriculum Policies Committee on the program review of the Department of Health and Physical Education and recommends that the Health and Physical Education programs be approved for a six-year period with the proviso that in two years the Department of Health and Physical Education, with the Dean of Health and Human Services, prepare a progress report to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs on the administration of the Health and Safety Studies major, the status of its concentrations, and its appropriate place in the College.

FS 00-10/CPC, Ex. REQUEST TO NEGOTIATE JOINT DOCTORATE

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the proposal to negotiate a joint doctoral program in Education between CSUS and the University of California, Davis (Attachment B).

In addition, the Faculty Senate requests that the Negotiation Committee be directed/requested to:

- 1) Ensure the interests of CSUS students are well served and resources are not drained to support a program in another system (UC).
- 2) Report back on progress before the proposal is formally presented.
- 3) Clarify goals of the program in terms of the College of Education's current goals for preparation of K-12 teachers.

FS 00-11/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS—Senate

Academic Policies Committee:

LISA ROBERTS, Library/Student Services, 2001 (repl. C. Martell)

General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee:

VIRGINIA KIDD, At-large, 2000 (repl. C. Newsome)

TOM PYNE, At-large, 2000 (repl. J. Bauerly)

FS 00-12/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS—University

Administrative Performance Review Committee:

ROB WASSMER, At-large, 2002 (Spring '00 only)

Persons with Disabilities, Committee for:

MANFRED HOPFE, CBA, 2001

REGULAR AGENDA

FS 00-08/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of February 17 (#9), 2000.

SECOND READING ITEMS

[Action may be taken]

[Note: Based on discussion at the February 17, 2000, Senate meeting, the Executive Committee has moved to substitute the following for FS 00-07 as originally presented on page 3 of the February 17, 2000, Faculty Senate Agenda.]

FS 00-07/APC, Ex. ^{FLR} GRADE CORRECTIONS, POLICY ON

Carried
The Faculty Senate recommends approval of revision of the Grade Change Policy as follows [strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition] *italics* indicate language in the 1998-2000 Catalog which was not in the University Manual document reviewed by the Academic Policies Committee]:

CHANGE CORRECTION POLICY

A grade correction is possible only in the case of a declared clerical error. A change correction in letter grade ~~may can~~ must be approved by the instructor of record and the department chairperson within 90 days after being by the last day of the semester, either spring or fall, after the grade is posted to the student's record. only in the case of a an error in grade calculation or posting declared clerical error. The definition of clerical error is an error made by the instructor or assistant in grade calculation estimating determination or posting. Under no circumstances, (except for completion of work missing when an "I" was issued), may a grade change be made as the result of work completed or presented following the close of a grade period. ~~Posted~~ Grades cannot be changed to "W" nor can they be changed from a letter grade to Credit/No credit.

Agreed A grade correction after the semester following grade award will be allowed only if the course instructor and chair of the department where the course was offered submit the grade change and an explanation for the late grade correction to the Registrar. In the absence of signatures from the instructor and/or department chair, the department faculty or a committee of department faculty must approve the Grade Correction. In such a case, a statement of the nature of the exception, the department's method of approval, and the date of approval must be forwarded with the Grade Correction. *where*

FIRST READING

[Discussion only—10 minute limit, unless extended by majority vote; no action.]

FS 00-13/APC, Ex. GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES (supercedes AS 88-67 and FS 98-45)

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the revised grade appeal procedures (Attachment C).

FS 00-14/Ex. CSU CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION, RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF REFORMING GOVERNANCE OF

The Faculty Senate adopts the following:

Whereas, A report, prepared for the San Jose State University Academic Senate, titled "Out of Crisis-Reforming Governance of the California State University" argues convincingly for the need to improve Central Administration governance of the California State University; and

Whereas, This report suggests a set of "solutions" which would lead to improved governance and provide accountability information to Academic/Faculty Senates; therefore, be it

- Resolved: That we, the Faculty Senate of California State University, Sacramento, endorse the San Jose State Report; and, be it further
- Resolved: That we request that CSU Central Administration develop a plan for assessing its effectiveness in providing management and leadership to the CSU system; and, be it further
- Resolved: We join San Jose State ^{as outlined in the report} in requesting that CSU Central Administration establish a task force; and, be it further
- Resolved: We request that the task force 1) implement this assessment plan by reviewing the efficacy of CSU Central Administration operation and budget, and 2) recommend changes in institutional approaches, policies and procedures, which would benefit the CSU system; and, be it further
- Resolved: We request that CSU Central Administration communicate both the findings and recommendations of the Task Force to CSU Academic/Faculty Senates; and, be it further
- Resolved: The CSU Central Administration communicate to CSU Academic/Faculty Senates the process to be used to respond to the Task Force recommendations; and, be it further
- Resolved: That CSU Central Administration establish a plan and schedule to institutionalize this "continual improvement" process.

INFORMATION

1. Tentative Spring 2000 Faculty Senate meeting schedule *[Note: Additional meetings may be scheduled]*:
 - March 23
 - April 13 (3:00-3:30, Nomination of 2000-2001 Officers), 27
 - May 4 (3:00-3:30, Election of 2000-2001 Officers), 11, 18
2. Senate Home Page: <http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page *then* Administration and Policy *then* Administration *then* Faculty Senate
3. Campus Safety--in response to Senator Hill's request (Attachment D)

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE ACADEMIC
PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION**

Governance (p. 4)

1. With such a diverse program, and despite the dedicated and concerned leadership of the Chair, Health and Physical Education should establish an Executive Committee comprised of members of the department's standing committees to advise the Department Chair. The External Consultant recommended a matrix model "in which coordinators meet regularly with the Department Chair on curricular issues."
2. Health and Physical Education might consider a Vice Chair to assist the Department Chair and encourage orderly executive transitions in a department with such variety of programs. The Consultant concurred.
3. Health and Physical Education committees should have representatives from different options. The Department might consider using representational ad hoc committees for hiring and Appointment, Retention, Tenure and Promotion committees.
4. Annual course offerings need a structured process to ensure that class scheduling is coordinated among options.
5. Health and Physical Education should institute procedures to consult regularly with students on program needs.
6. The Health and Physical Education Chair, Athletic Training Faculty, and the Director of Athletics need regular meetings to improve communication, scheduling, supervision, and student internship.
7. An informal advisory group of the Department's full professors might provide a greater range of opinions on critical issues. This would be more important if the Department does not implement the matrix model or executive committee. The Consultant recommended this in addition to a matrix model.

Teacher Education (p. 9)

1. The Department should revisit its mission statement to determine if it is appropriate to position the credential as a higher priority than other areas of the curriculum, given the number of students served and the number of faculty involved.

2. The Department devise means, in surveying its graduates, to learn why students who have prepared themselves for a credential subsequently do not enter the credential program.
3. A capstone seminar course for its Credential students focusing on career opportunities would help increase the number of students who choose the Credential Program. It would also provide a synthesis of teaching concepts for the majority of students who never enter the formal Credential Program.
4. When the faculty restructure their major, they should pursue efforts to integrate "methods" curriculum with the School of Education to eliminate redundancy in course content.
5. A scheduling conflict over analysis classes between Athletic Training students and Teaching Option students exists with little sign of resolution. The Self-Study indicated that there was a "conflict in scheduling core courses for Exercise Physiology and Kinesiology and Physical Therapy," and that it will be corrected with minimal impact on the Teaching Option students.
6. Health and Physical Education should establish a mechanism to reconcile the scheduling needs of its various options. Options establishing their respective needs separately and the Chair implementing Option needs is inadequate. The Options are too interdependent to be scheduled separately from each other.
7. Faculty should review the emphasis upon Early Childhood topics and infuse the program with more content on secondary school needs. This would meet concerns voiced by many students.
8. Health and Physical Education might consider grooming another faculty member to assist Scott Model in the Adaptive Physical Education Program.

Athletic Training (p. 11)

1. The Athletic Director and Physical Education Chair must establish procedures and funds providing for equal opportunities for female trainers to travel with the sports teams. They should meet regularly to assure the integration of these students into the Athletic program field experiences.
2. Health and Physical Education arrange funds from within its budget or from the College to ensure student access to the fieldwork.
3. The Health and Physical Education Chair must work out advanced registration arrangements to ensure Training students' enrollment in classes during morning hours.

4. CASPER procedures could be reviewed to facilitate majors securing their required courses during the hours available to them for class work due to programmatic field experiences.
5. Health and Physical Education should review existing low passing rates for Athletic Training certification and develop a plan to improve the passing rate. The External Consultant concurred and urged that the percent of students passing the CAAHEP certification could be increased significantly. Health and Physical Education might consider workshops designed specifically to prepare students for the examination.
6. Health and Physical Education should continue to explore ways to satisfy the pharmacology requirement its accrediting agency will require without adding another course to its requirements.
7. Management training should be included within one of the required classes.
8. The Athletic Director and Health and Physical Education Chair need to meet to resolve the failure to provide supervision and support to Athletic Training students. Despite the care he has provided, primary supervision by a one-year appointed Assistant Athletic Trainer is inadequate and resented by the students. A permanent solution must be found. If this meeting is unable to find a satisfactory solution, then it may be necessary to seek resolution from the Central Administration.

Exercise Science and Pre-Physical Therapy (p. 14)

1. Faculty should examine how theory and concepts related to motor control are included in the curriculum. The Motor Learning course (PE 158) should be examined to determine if an adequate amount of motor control is currently being taught.
2. Internship supervision must continue to be carefully structured and supervised in the Pre-Physical Therapy option to assure students of a valuable site experience.
3. Health and Physical Education and Physical Therapy should discuss cooperative scheduling of the Physical Therapy labs in Solano Hall. The Dean may have to act as mediator to resolve respective needs.
4. Health and Physical Education should establish more structured advising procedures to assure all its students receive appropriate advising.
5. Faculty should consider eliminating the required field experience courses, PE 195B and elective PE 199B, for the new Pre-Therapy Option that is combined with the Exercise Science option.

6. The Department and the Review Team support re-organizing the options so that this academic area is combined with the Exercise Science Option and that the name of the option is changed to reflect the increased breadth. Consequently, the Athletic Training/Pre-Physical Therapy Option should be changed to an Athletic Training Option.

Dance (p. 20)

1. Dance could remain within Health and Physical Education for the short term, but it would be wise to move it eventually to more suitable artistic environment than the science-oriented Health and Physical Department. The faculty state they have a fine dance studio and with the addition of the staff technician to maintain their equipment, they have indicated they are content to remain within Health and Physical Education. They have the strong support of their Dean who gave assurances he will support their program.
2. Dance should revisit its mission statement to decide its direction-- performance or credential students. If it chooses to concentrate upon performance, a more realistic direction, then it should reorient its curriculum away from science and recruitment away from credential students to strengthen its performance courses.
3. CSUS should revisit the appropriate home for Dance on our campus. The Consultant Report on Strategic Planning in the Arts suggested a Center for the Performing Arts, perhaps located in the College of Arts and Letters, joining together the Music, Theater Arts, and Dance Program. This relocation would satisfy many problems for Dance. David Gallahue, the External Consultant, concurred that for the short term Dance remain with Health and Physical Education with the caveat that should a Fine Arts Department be formed, consideration be given to their relocation.
4. Howard Harris, Associate Vice President for Facilities Management, should re-examine the propriety of charging Dance faculty for rehearsal rooms. This practice impedes faculty and student development for little real reason.
5. Dance faculty must comply with requirements to submit course syllabi to the Chair for review as do all other faculty. Should they not comply, the Chair should consider whether to continue their courses in General Education.
6. Faculty should adopt an assessment tool such as the portfolio model used by colleagues in the Physical Education Credential Option.

Health and Safety Studies (p. 29)

1. The Health and Safety Studies program needs to develop a Strategic Plan by Spring 2001 which identifies curricular direction and goals for the next three to five years, consistent with the mission of the unit, the College of Health and Human Services, and the University. Resource needs, material, human, and financial should be addressed in the Plan.
2. The strategic plan should be developed under the direct supervision of the Dean of Health and Human Services. Upon completion of the plan, Health and Safety Studies needs structuring to promote effective governance and to ensure implementation of the curriculum. The best fit for organization placement should be determined at that time.
3. Curricular options should be reduced and/or fully implemented to reflect the unit's mission and goals. The faculty might consider the Community Health focus as the External Consultant recommended.
4. Communication must be improved within the unit and across disciplines in the Department.
5. Class schedules need careful coordination to provide greater flexibility to students seeking to expedite completion of degree requirements. Faculty should seek student input for class scheduling to balance faculty needs and the additional part time hires.
6. All faculty should participate in a mandatory advising seminar in which they are oriented to the program, all options, degree requirements, and transfer equivalencies.
7. All faculty must be held accountable for all teaching responsibilities, so that the work load be balanced. Advising should be equally distributed among full-time faculty, and faculty should be accountable.
8. The Coordinator for the Option must delegate more responsibilities to the faculty in advising and internship supervision.
9. Curriculum needs revision in Occupational Health and Safety to remove the redundancy in HS 106, 107, and 108. Three courses might be condensed into two courses, focusing on "health" and "safety" respectively.
10. The curriculum should also be strengthened to meet the certification requirements of the Board of Certified Safety Specialists and/or the Bureau of Certified Industrial Hygienists. In order do this, toxicology and other job related concepts and diseases should be in integrated into the curriculum. A stronger science base should considered.

Graduate Program (p. 31)

1. Health and Physical Education should review faculty compensation for advising of culminating experience work. It should consider including non-graduate faculty in the culminating experience evaluation. It is not recommended that the Department discontinue the thesis/project. David Gallahue, the External Consultant, noted that Health and Physical Education needed some mechanism to encourage undergraduate faculty to participate in the culminating experience evaluation.
2. Graduate faculty should expand their number to include faculty presently teaching only undergraduate offerings. Health and Physical Education has established a distinction between graduate faculty and undergraduate faculty. Expansion of electives might be a vehicle to encourage more faculty participation in graduate instruction.
3. The Graduate Faculty should review the electives offered within the two options and consider offering additional courses and/or substituting courses as electives.
4. Health and Physical Education must review student enrollment demands. Health and Physical Education should formulate a plan to resolve the lack of room for students in required seminars. Student admittance to graduate studies should be reduced or arrangements must be made to increase seminar capacity beyond fifteen.
5. The CSUS Library should either speed up journal binding or postpone binding the journals. Health and Physical Education should consult with the Library to arrange a solution.
6. The External Consultant suggested the Department might consider hiring a faculty member in the area of Wellness "to serve as a bridge with those in the health and perhaps lead to an expanded graduate program in corporate wellness or clinical exercise physiology."

Institutional Support (p. 34)

1. The Chair and Graduate Coordinator should meet with the Library staff to iron out their problem with periodical binding.
2. The Chair and the Physical Therapy Chair should meet to arrange sharing usage of Physical Therapy labs.

Miscellaneous Recommendations Made by the External Consultant and Supported by the Review Team

1. The name of the Department of Physical Education be changed to the Department of Kinesiology.
2. The Department investigate ways of increasing its liaison with Junior college officials to assure their awareness of prerequisites and to encourage their advising students to take those prerequisites before transferring to CSUS.
3. The Department continue to maintain a strong and viable physical activity program to help assure the positive view of the Department held by the campus community and the local off-campus community.

Faculty Senate (p. 34)

The Review Team recommends that Health and Physical Education programs be approved for a six-year period with the proviso that in two years Health and Physical Education, with the Dean of Health and Human Services, prepare a progress report to the Provost and Academic Vice President on the administration of the Health and Safety Studies major, the status of its concentrations, and its appropriate place in the College.

12-15-99

Proposal to Seek Permission to Negotiate
Joint Doctoral Program in Education
Between
California State University, Sacramento
and
University of California, Davis

The purpose of this brief proposal is to seek permission for CSUS to formally initiate discussions regarding the development of a joint doctoral program in Education with UC, Davis (UCD). The goal of this program is to better prepare future education faculty. We now have a very successful cooperative venture with UCD in delivering a teacher credential program. The proposed joint doctorate is a natural next step.

NEED

There is clearly a need in the state of California to continue its reputation for high quality faculty of education. Several CSU reports indicate that as many as 60% of its education faculty will retire within the next 5 years. As well, there has been an increasing national interest to ensure that faculty coming from research universities also have the skills for the demands of comprehensive universities. It has been reported that over seventy percent the faculty who teach in Education and Liberal Studies programs receive their doctorates from research institutions. A re-socialization to emphasize the role of teaching is often required of those prepared with a primary research emphasis. The key to being an effective faculty member in the regional comprehensive university is the ability to move from theory to practice in ones teaching, research and service through collaboration with students and colleagues in both higher education and the K-12 community. To this end, the Association of American Schools, Colleges and Universities has been funded by the PEW Charitable Trust to address the issue of how to better prepare future faculty in higher education to improve the education of undergraduate and graduate students. Currently, UCD has one of theses Preparing Future Faculty grants.

PROPOSED PROGRAM

The primary purpose of the proposed program is to prepare exemplary Educational leaders and Education faculty for positions in regional, comprehensive institutions that give emphasis to teaching, applied research, and

service through collaboration with K-12 and other educational organizations. With the research perspective of the UC and the application of research perspective of CSUS, the program combines the strengths of the two universities. That the CSUS/UCD program will be co-joined with a cooperative teacher credentialing program is truly unique.

There are three fundamental components to this unique program. First, the recognition that regional, comprehensive institutions emphasize primarily effective teaching as a foundation of the academic culture, which is subsequently supported through applied research. Second, the need to bridge to K-12 institutions requires faculty with skills for collaborating with schools as equal partners in advancing school reform. Third, a teaching and research postdoctoral fellowship will ensure faculty mentoring and acculturation to institutional norms and expectations. This will also serve as a fertile ground for exploring theory and engaging in applied research, reflective practice, and collaboration.

In addition to affirming the University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU) Systems' commitment to K-12 educational improvement, this program is also intended to support UC's outreach programs through recruitment of program participants, in particular, those educators eager for advanced study in currently under-served areas. CSUS certainly shares these goals and brings to the table a long history of working in partnership with the K-12 community. The joint program also has the advantage of drawing upon the complementary strengths of UC and CSU to create a richer educational experience. UC and CSU faculty working together have the capacity to prepare future education faculty grounded in theory who will then be able to guide others to link that theory to the practice of improving K-12 schools for all students.

This program can also serve as a model for joint doctoral programs between research and comprehensive institutions. A program that prepares and socializes its candidates to the teaching, applied research, and collaborative K-12 service is essential to the success of faculty who work to fulfill the mission of the comprehensive university. This collaborative approach to university faculty

preparation parallels that of the K-12 institution's role as a partner with the regional comprehensive institutions in the preparation of future K-12 teachers.

While future discussions will consider the content areas to emphasize, this program will assist California to maintain its role in education linked to practice.

Approved by College of Education Academic Affairs Committee on Thursday
October 14, 1999.

Approved by College of Education's Advisory Council on Thursday,
October 21, 1999.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

FACULTY SENATE

Memo

Date: February 4, 2000

To: Bob Buckley, Chair
Faculty Senate

From: Gregory Wheeler, Chair
Academic Policies Committee

William A. Dillon, Presiding Member
University Grade Appeals Procedural Appeals Board

Re: Revision of Grade Appeal Process

The Academic Policies Committee recommends adoption of the attached revision of the Grade Appeals Process.

This revision has been written to put an end to several difficulties embedded in the current process. They are 1) no effective guidance to students about valid objections to a grade, 2) no guidance to instructors as to when a grade has been appropriately assigned and should survive an appeal, 3) no provision for a chair's attempt to settle a grade appeal informally by mediation, 4) a formal trial type process requiring face to face confrontation provocative of bitterness, acrimony, intransigence and the losing party's determination to renew the battle on appeal, and 5) a formal process leaving little or no record that might help the Procedural Appeals Board decide appeals arising from the process.

The revision cures each of these defects. Consistent with basic understandings governing the scope and limits of administrative power, it explains that reasonable grading is appropriate grading and thus describes the scope of an instructor's discretion to choose the grade to assign. It also explains the three objections to an exercise of discretion commonly recognized in the relevant literature and thus tells students what must be alleged and proved to overcome the University's presumption that every grade is reasonable. The Committee hopes that these provisions will guide and support the members of the University when discussing and deciding the appropriateness of grades.

6000 J Street, Sacramento, California 95819-6036 • (916) 278-6593 • (916) 278-5358 FAX

The revision restores to the grade appeals process the chance for a willing chair to mediate a grade dispute. Chairs who are comfortable doing so have successfully precluded the formal resolution of these disputes by their intervention in more cases than have come to a formal resolution. At the same time, the revision requires the chair to explain the grade appeal process and give students thinking about an appeal a copy of the document to help them understand what must be done to go forward with the appeal.

Finally, the revision takes an alternative but by no means unusual approach to the determination of an appeal of action taken within a state agency. Instead of face to face confrontation in a hearing mimicking a court trial, the revision asks the parties to proceed entirely by writing to argue their positions. The advantages of the written hearing are 1) more carefully thought out, organized and articulated statements of position, 2) a substantial record for the sake of procedural appeals, if any, and 3) an end to the stress generated by personal confrontation, charge, counter-charge, personal abuse and cross examination by parties untrained in the art.

The Committee hopes that the Senate will agree with it that the revision proposed will cure the defects outlined above and will, accordingly, adopt it.

WD/GW:j
Attachment

OUTLINE
CSUS GRADE APPEAL PROCESS

- I. GRADES THAT MAY BE APPEALED BY THIS PROCESS:
ASSIGNED FINAL LETTER OR CREDIT/NO CREDIT GRADES...BUT NOT
 1. INCOMPLETES MAY NOT BE APPEALED...
 2. "U" GRADES MAY NOT BE APPEALED.
 3. GRADES ASSIGNED TO DISCRETE PERFORMANCES INDEPENDENTLY...

- II. GROUNDS FOR APPEAL AND BURDEN OR PROOF:
TO CONVINCING A GRADE APPEAL PANEL TO ALTER A GRADE, A STUDENT SHALL ALLEGE AND PROVE BY A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING COMPELLING REASONS FOR CHANGING THE GRADE ASSIGNED.
 - A. THAT THE INSTRUCTOR ASSIGNED THE GRADE ARBITRARILY
 - B. THAT THE INSTRUCTOR ASSIGNED THE GRADE CAPRICIOUSLY
 - C. THAT THE INSTRUCTOR ASSIGNED THE GRADE BECAUSE OF PREJUDICE
 - D. THAT THE INSTRUCTOR'S GRADING PRACTICE WAS SUBSTANTIALLY INCONSISTENT WITH THE DISCUSSION OF GRADING, IF ANY, IN THE COURSE SYLLABUS

- III. PRESUMPTION:
BEFORE A GRADE APPEAL PANEL SHALL INVITE A GRADER TO RESPOND...

- IV. DEFENSES TO AN APPEAL:
 - A. PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE REQUIREMENT
 - B. DEFINITION OF CAREFUL EVALUATION
 - C. DEFINITION OF SUBSTANTIAL CONSISTENCY BETWEEN GRADING PRACTICE AND DISCUSSION OF IT, IF ANY, ON THE COURSE SYLLABUS
 - D. PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE STANDARD

- V. MEANING OF TERMS DEFINING DEADLINES

- VI. GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES--SUMMARY OF BASIC STEPS:
 - A. INFORMAL MEDIATION
 1. STUDENT MEETS WITH INSTRUCTOR

2. STUDENT MEETS WITH DEPARTMENT CHAIR
 3. CHAIR ATTEMPTS TO SETTLE DISPUTE INFORMALLY
- B. FORMAL PROCEDURES
1. STUDENT GRADE APPEAL FORM
 2. GRADE APPEAL HEARING
- VII. GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES: DETAILED STEP GUIDELINES
- A. INFORMAL MEDIATION
1. STUDENT MEETS WITH INSTRUCTOR
 2. STUDENT MEETS WITH DEPARTMENT CHAIR
 3. CHAIR ATTEMPTS TO SETTLE DISPUTE INFORMALLY
- B. FORMAL PROCEDURES
1. STUDENT GRADE APPEAL FORM
 2. GRADE APPEAL PANEL
 - a. SELECTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS
 - b. SELECTION OF STUDENT MEMBER
 - c. INITIAL MEETING OF PANEL...
 3. PANEL HEARINGS
 - a. PANELS SHALL PROCEED TO DETERMINE GRADE APPEALS ON THE WRITTEN SUBMISSION...
 - b. THE STUDENT SHALL BE ADVISED BY THE CHAIR...
 - (1) A NARRATIVE OF FACT DEFINING THE APPEAL
 - (2) A CLEAR AND CONCISE STATEMENT OF HIS OR HER OBJECTION...
 - (3) HIS OR HER ARGUMENT...
 - (4) EVIDENCE
 - c. THE STUDENT SHALL SUBMIT...
 - d. THE CHAIR SHALL DISTRIBUTE...
 - e. ...PANEL SHALL MEET
 - f. FACTS INSUFFICIENT...DISMISSAL OF APPEAL
 - g. FACTS SUFFICIENT, PANEL ADVISES CHAIR
 - h. CHAIR ADVISES FACULTY OF RIGHT TO SUBMIT WRITTEN RESPONSE...
 - i. WITHIN 10 BUSINESS DAYS...FACULTY SHALL
 - j. STUDENT HAS FIVE BUSINESS DAYS TO REBUT
 - k. PARTIES HAVE RIGHT TO SUBMIT WRITTEN STATEMENT OF OTHERS...
 - l. WITHIN FIVE BUSINESS DAYS...PANEL SHALL MEET
 - m. PANEL SHALL BASE ITS DETERMINATION ON PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE.

- n. PANEL MAY INVITE PARTIES TO SUPPLY INFORMATION WANTED
- o. DECISION OF APPEAL SHALL BE BY SIMPLE MAJORITY...
- p. IF DECISION FOR PARTY APPEALING, FACULTY MEMBERS OF PANEL SHALL DETERMINE AT ONCE THE GRADE TO BE AWARDED AND THE REASONS FOR IT
- q. DECISION ABOUT THE GRADE TO ASSIGN IN A SUCCESSFUL APPEAL SHALL BE BY CONCURRENCE OF FACULTY MEMBERS OF PANEL
- r. WITHIN FIVE BUSINESS DAYS, PANEL SHALL PUBLISH THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF ITS DECISION CONTAINING:
 - (1) CLEAR AND CONCISE NARRATIVE OF ITS UNDERSTANDING OF THE FACTS
 - (2) CLEAR AND CONCISE STATEMENT OF ITS UNDERSTANDING OF THE OBJECTIONS TO THE DISPUTED GRADE
 - (3) CLEAR AND CONCISE STATEMENT OF DECISION...
- s. PANEL SHALL SUBMIT ITS WRITTEN DECISION TO THE CHAIR...
- t. CHAIR SHALL CHANGE GRADE...
- u. SUMMARY REPORT OF THE NUMBER OF CASES HEARD AND DISPOSITION OF EACH

C. SUMMARY OF DEADLINES

D. SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS BY PARTY

VIII. APPEAL OF VIOLATIONS OF PROCEDURE:

CSUS GRADE APPEAL PROCESS

I. GRADES THAT MAY BE APPEALED BY THIS PROCESS

Assigned final letter or Credit/No Credit grades, otherwise known as course grades, may be appealed; but

1. incompletes may not be appealed until a final letter or Credit/No Credit grade has been assigned.
2. "U" grades may not be appealed.
3. grades assigned to particular pieces of student work or to particular student performances may not be appealed independently of their influence on the calculation of a course grade.

II. GROUNDS FOR APPEAL AND BURDEN OF PROOF

To convince a grade appeal panel to alter a grade, a student shall allege and prove by a preponderance of the evidence one or more of the following compelling reasons for changing the grade assigned.

A. **That the instructor assigned the grade arbitrarily.**

Note: To make out a case of arbitrary grading, a student shall show that the instructor would not or could not give any reasons for the grade assigned rooted in the substance and form of the work submitted for grading either when that graded work was returned or subsequently in a routine conference to discuss the student's performance before the student had begun to seek any relief from the grade appeal process.

B. **That the instructor assigned the grade capriciously.**

Note: To make out a case of capricious grading, a student shall show that the grade assigned was the result of an abrupt change in the feeling, opinion or action of the instructor proceeding from a whim or an irrational or fanciful notion.

C. **That the instructor assigned the grade because of prejudice.**

Note: To make out a case of prejudice, the student shall show that the grade was assigned on the basis of a judgment or opinion conceived before the submitted work had been evaluated or entirely apart from the work or on an unreasonable predilection or objection to the student or the work, especially an opinion or leaning adverse to the student or the work without just grounds or before sufficient knowledge had been obtained to justify that opinion or predilection in reason. Cases of prejudice on the basis of race or sex shall, of course, be included in this category of compelling reasons but shall not exhaust it.

D. That the instructor's practice of grading the student was substantially inconsistent with the discussion of grading, if any, in the course syllabus.

Note: To make out a case of substantial inconsistency between grading practice and the syllabus in pertinent part, if any, the student shall show that the grading practice or practices giving rise to the disputed grade or grades in its or their fundamental, essential or basic character does not accord with the fundamental, essential or basic character of grading practice disclosed expressly and explicitly in the syllabus. An inconsistency as to mere detail shall not suffice to make the case. The student shall then show that the disputed grade is directly attributable to the substantial inconsistency between practice and syllabus.

III. PRESUMPTION

Before a grade appeal panel shall invite an instructor to respond to an allegation and proof of that grading has been arbitrary, capricious, or prejudicial or substantially inconsistent with a discussion of grading, if any, in a syllabus as defined in II.A, B ~~and~~ C and D above, the panel shall decide whether the student has made out, by his or her un rebutted argument and evidence, a case convincing enough to overcome the presumption that the grade has been assigned reasonably assigned and by means of a grading practice that is substantially consistent with the discussion of practice, if any, in the syllabus. If the panel decides that the student has made out a case convincing enough to overcome the presumption of a reasonably and otherwise lawfully assigned grade in the mind of its members, it shall invite the instructor to defend the grade assigned and argue that it should be maintained. If the panel decides that the student has not made out a case convincing enough to overcome the presumption, it shall dismiss the appeal at once and conclude the matter.

IV. DEFENSES TO AN APPEAL

- A. To convince a grade appeal panel to maintain the grade assigned, an instructor defending a disputed grade shall show by a preponderance of the evidence that the disputed grade was assigned reasonably and in a manner substantially consistent with the discussion of grading, if any, in the course syllabus.
- B. A reasonably assigned grade is one that results from a careful evaluation of the work submitted for grading reported to the Registrar in a timely manner. Work has been carefully evaluated (1) if the purpose of the evaluation has been to ascertain from the substance and form of the work itself the relative quality of the work submitted, (2) if the means of evaluation are reasonably related to achieving that purpose and (3) if the means of expressing that evaluation include some explanation of the results of it to enable the student to distinguish the better work from the worse for him- or herself. Grades so assigned are grades reasonably assigned within the meaning of this policy. Note: Means of evaluation are reasonably related to achieving the purpose of evaluation if, in

the judgment of a grade appeal panel, they fall within a continuum of conceivable choices of means bounded on the one hand by means plainly or obviously adapted to the purpose and on the other by means not wholly or completely unrelated to it. A panel may not limit the extent of this discretion by substituting its own choice of reasonable means for an instructor's choice, provided the instructor's choice is within the continuum described in this note.

C. A grading practice is substantially consistent with a discussion of grading in a course syllabus to the extent that one exists if the practice in its fundamental, basic or essential character accords with the fundamental, basic or essential character of grading practice disclosed by the syllabus. A showing of substantial consistency shall not require a showing of consistency in detail.

D. Preponderance of the evidence shall be the standard of proof in grade appeals. The preponderance standard requires the grade appeal panel (the panel) to consider or weigh the evidence before it as to quantity, in the sense of enough to support a finding of fact, quality and source and to reach conclusions of fact supported by a preponderance of the evidence before it. Determining preponderance is a matter of judgment, not a calculation of a quantity of units. It involves considering carefully the knowledge and credibility of witnesses and the kind and quality of physical evidence before the panel. The result of that careful consideration is a determination of the facts that define the grade appeal and either support or refute the student's allegation that a grade has been assigned arbitrarily, capriciously or with prejudice or by means of a grading practice substantially inconsistent with the discussion of grading practice, if any, in the syllabus.

V. MEANING OF TERMS DEFINING DEADLINES

Compliance with the deadlines stated throughout this document shall be determined with an eye to substantial justice and common sense. The deadlines shall not be regarded as existing for their own sake but as a means of moving an appeal along expeditiously to a just and reasonable conclusion. For the purposes of determining compliance with deadlines established by this policy, the following definitions shall apply.

A. A week of classes shall normally be a period within a semester of five consecutive business days when classes are held. It shall begin at 8:00 a.m. Monday and end at 5:00 p.m. on the following Friday. A week of classes shall not include a Saturday or a Sunday or both. A week of classes shall not lose its character by being shortened by the presence within it of an academic holiday, such as Labor Day or Thanksgiving and the Friday following it.

- B. A business day shall be the period beginning at 8:00 a.m. on a day of a week of classes and ending at 5:00 p.m. of that day. Neither Saturdays, Sundays nor academic holidays shall be accounted as business days.
- C. Where the term “day” is distinguished from the term “business day,” the term “day” shall refer to any 24-hour period beginning at 12:00 midnight and concluding subsequently at 12:00 midnight.
- D. A semester shall be that period defined by reference to a first day and a last day as published by the University in its academic calendar.
- E. Delivery of written submissions by a student or an instructor, parties to a grade appeal, to a unit chair or to a unit secretary for delivery to a chair in order to meet a deadline under this policy shall be accomplished when the chair or secretary receiving the submission has it in hand with knowledge of or the opportunity to know what it is.

V. GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES:

- A. Grade Appeals shall be in order during the Fall and Spring semesters of an academic year and at no other times.
- B. **Summary of Basic Steps**
 - 1. **Informal Process**
 - a. Student Meets With Instructor
 - b. Student Meets With Unit Chair
 - c. Chair Attempts to Resolve the Grade Dispute Informally
 - 2. **Formal Procedures**
 - a. Student Submits Grade Appeal Form
 - b. Grade Appeal Panel Conducts Hearing

VI. GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES IN DETAIL:

A. **Informal Process**

1. **Chair delivers this document to student.**

At the first meeting between a student who disputes a grade and the chair (program coordinator or director) of the academic unit (division, department or program) in which the grade was assigned, the chair shall deliver a copy of this document to the student. This meeting may take place before or after the meeting between student and instructor provided

below depending upon the way the student begins to question the disputed grade.

2. Student meets with instructor.

Students who believe that they have not received a reasonably assigned grade shall seek to resolve, in good faith, the matter informally with the instructor who assigned the grade. This shall be done as soon as possible, but no later than the end of the third week of classes of the semester following the semester in which the grade was assigned.

3. Student notifies department chair.

If the informal meeting between student and instructor does not result in a solution of the grade dispute satisfactory to the student, the student shall so notify the chair of the academic unit in which the grade was assigned. Such notification shall be given to the chair or to the academic unit's secretary to give to the chair no later than the end of the last business day of the fourth week of classes of the semester following the semester in which the grade was assigned. A student's failure to meet this deadline shall end the grade appeal.

4. Chair schedules meeting with student to review process.

Upon being notified of the failure of the meeting between the student and instructor to produce a satisfactory result, the chair shall schedule at once a meeting with the student to discuss the grounds of appeal and the formal process for resolving a grade dispute. This meeting shall take place before the end of the last business day of the fifth week of classes. (please see subsection 6 below)

5. Chair seeks informal settlement.

During the interval between being notified of the failure of the meeting between the student and the instructor and the end of the last business day of the sixth week of classes, the chair shall seek an informal resolution of the grade dispute that is agreeable to both parties. To this end, the chair may meet or otherwise communicate with each party separately or with both together. Topics of discussion may include but not be limited to: 1) what each party thinks happened, 2) what each party intended by his or her part in the transactions giving rise to the dispute, 3) feelings provoked in each party by the conduct of the other and the situation, 4) what each party actually wants from the appeal (sometimes something other than an alteration or preservation of the grade), and 5) the consequences of settling or not settling short of a formal appeal.

6. Student meets with chair to review formal process.

Before the end of the last business day of the fifth week of classes while the chair is seeking to resolve the grade dispute informally as provided in subsection 5 above, the chair shall meet with the student. At this meeting the chair shall provide the student with a document that 1) identifies the grounds for appealing a grade (i.e., that the instructor assigned the grade arbitrarily, capriciously, ~~or because of~~ with prejudice or in a manner substantially inconsistent with the discussion of grading practice, if any, in the syllabus), and 2) defines the terms “arbitrarily,” “capriciously,” ~~and “because of with prejudice,”~~ and “grading practice substantially inconsistent with discussion...” as those terms are defined in Sections II.A, B ~~and~~, C and D of the CSUS Grade Appeal Process. The chair shall ask the student if he or she understands the grounds for a grade appeal and shall provide clarification if the student requests it. At this meeting, the chair shall tell or otherwise inform the student that if one chooses to begin a formal grade appeal, he or she must do so by submitting a Student Grade Appeal Form to the chair by the end of the last business day of the seventh week of classes. The chair shall remind the student to follow the provisions of the Grade Appeal Process carefully and to comply with the deadlines set by it. (Please see subsection 4 above and the schedule of deadlines appended to this document.)

7. Conflicts of explanation with policy.

Any conflict between the stated provisions of this document and statements or omissions of explanation by a chair shall be resolved in favor of the stated provisions of this document.

8. Evidence of informal process is inadmissible during formal process.

Nothing said or done in the course of informal attempts to resolve a grade dispute shall be admissible as evidence in formal proceedings authorized by this document.

9. Confidentiality of informal process and its product.

Everything said or done in the course of informal attempts to resolve a grade dispute shall remain confidential. Confidentiality shall extend to the terms upon which a grade dispute may be informally resolved. Violations of confidentiality shall be subject to appropriate University action.

B. Formal Procedures

1. Student Grade Appeal Form.

Students wishing to initiate a formal grade appeal shall fill out the Student Grade Appeal Form (see attached) and submit four (4) copies of it to the chair of the academic unit in which the grade was assigned by the end of the last business day of the seventh week of classes of the semester following the semester in which the disputed grade was assigned. Failure to meet this deadline shall conclude the appeal. One copy shall be ~~retained by the student~~ placed in the chair's file, one forwarded to the instructor, one forwarded to the Associated Students, Inc., and one held for the Grade Appeal Panel as outlined below. Upon receipt of the appeal form, the chair shall establish a Grade Appeal Panel as outlined below.

2. Grade Appeal Panel.

The Grade Appeal Panel shall consist of two full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty from the academic unit in which the grade was assigned, and one student who shall be an upper-division or graduate student in good standing currently registered in an undergraduate or graduate program in the College in which the academic unit is located. An upper division student in good standing shall serve on the panel to hear the appeal of an undergraduate. A graduate student in good standing shall serve on the panel to hear the appeal of a graduate student. One faculty member shall serve as chair.

a. Selection of Faculty.

- (1) The unit chair shall randomly select eight prospective panel members (who shall be numbered in order of selection) from the list of full-time tenured or tenure track faculty members within the academic unit (excluding those on sabbaticals or other leaves and those involved in the appeal) or related units as determined by the unit chair in those cases where there is an insufficient number of eligible faculty members. If any faculty member selected is unwilling or unable to serve, due to extenuating circumstances, random selection shall continue until the names of eight faculty members willing and able to serve have been drawn.
- (2) The unit chair shall inform the student and the instructor of the eight names on the list. During the 48 hours following, each of the parties shall then have the right to challenge up to two names on the list for any reason or no reason at all. The first two unchallenged names on the list shall be the faculty panel members and the other unchallenged faculty shall be alternates.

b. Selection of Student.

- (1) Immediately following the census date, i.e., the end of the fourth week of classes, the University Admissions and Records Office shall, as a matter of routine, produce and forward to the Associated Students, Inc., each of the following documents:
 - (a) A mailing list and labels of 100 randomly identified upper division students in good standing registered in undergraduate majors in each of the colleges, and
 - (b) A mailing list and labels of 100 randomly identified graduate students in good standing registered in graduate programs in each of the colleges.
- (2) The Admissions and Records Office as sender and the Associated Students, Inc., as recipient shall keep confidential the information contained in the lists and labels produced under this section.
- (3) If the need of students to serve on the grade appeals panels exceeds the supply of students listed, the Associated Students, Inc., shall formally request the Admissions and Records Office to provide additional lists and labels as described above.
- (4) In each instance of a grade appeal, the academic unit in which the appeal is filed shall forward to Associated Students, Inc., a copy of the grade appeal form. When received by Associated Students, Inc., this copy shall constitute notice of a unit's need of a student to serve on a grade appeal panel. That student shall be selected as provided below.
- (5) Upon receiving the grade appeal form forwarded by the unit, the Associated Students, Inc., Government Office shall randomly select from the appropriate list provided by the Admissions and Records Office four prospective panel members (who shall be numbered in order of selection). If the student appealing is an undergraduate, each of the selected students shall be an upper division student. If the student appealing is a graduate student, each of the selected students shall be a graduate student. Associated Students, Inc., shall ascertain the willingness of each student selected to serve. Random selection shall continue until a list of four qualified students willing and able to serve has been drawn.

- (6) The Associated Students, Inc., shall inform the student and the faculty member of the names of the four students selected. Each of the parties, the student and the instructor, shall then have 48 hours to challenge simultaneously one name on the list for any reason or no reason at all. The first unchallenged name on the list shall be the student panel member and the other unchallenged students shall be alternates.
- c. Once selected, members of the panel shall regard themselves as triers of fact, not advocates of the parties. They shall therefore approach the matter before them impartially and shall manage it judiciously.
- d. An initial meeting of the panel shall be held within seven (7) business days after the selection of the panel. The Department chair shall designate a faculty member of the panel to convene the initial meeting.
- e. The panel shall select its own chair from between the two faculty members at the initial meeting of the panel. The chair shall be responsible for seeing to it that the appeal is heard in an orderly fashion and a decision reached as promptly as possible.

3. Procedures to govern panel hearings.

- a. Panels shall decide grade appeals on the written submissions of the student and the instructor, parties to the grade appeal. When reviewing the written submissions of the parties, panels shall rely on the sort of evidence on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs but shall exclude evidence that is irrelevant or unduly repetitious. Panels shall not review the submissions of the parties in light of technical rules of evidence or of examining witnesses.
- b. The student shall be advised by the chair of the academic unit in which the appeal was filed of his or her right to make a written submission to the panel explaining the appeal and containing at least the following:
 - (1) A narrative of fact defining the appeal. The narrative shall state clearly and concisely the actions of the instructor giving rise to the appeal and the actions taken by the student at the time of grading or as soon afterward as he or she learned of the grade to make the instructor aware of his or her objection or objections to the grade.
 - (2) A clear and concise statement of his or her objection or objections to the grade. For example: "The grade was assigned arbitrarily, capriciously or with prejudice or by means of a grading practice that is substantially inconsistent with the discussion of grading practice, if any, in the syllabus."

- (3) His or her reasons for believing that the narrated facts show that the grade appealed has been assigned arbitrarily, capriciously ~~or~~, with prejudice or by means of a substantially inconsistent grading practice as those terms are defined in Section II.A, B ~~and~~, C and D of this document.
 - (4) The evidence of fact that he or she wishes to put before the panel in support of the claim that the grade being appealed has been assigned arbitrarily, capriciously ~~or~~, with prejudice or by means of a substantially inconsistent grading practice. This evidence shall include every piece of written work or record, if any, of performance or both directly bearing on the assignment of the disputed grade. This evidence may include written testimony by self or others or physical evidence or both supporting claims of relevant fact made in the student's narrative of fact.
 - (5) The student's statement of the grade that he or she is seeking and an argument supported by relevant evidence to justify it.
- c. The student shall also be advised by the chair of his or her right to seek and obtain, on his or her own, assistance to prepare the submissions described above and below, provided that the source of assistance is not an attorney-at-law.
 - d. The student shall submit to the chair of the academic unit in which the appeal was filed the writing described in 3.b.1-5 above by the end of the tenth business day following the day of filing the Student Grade Appeal Form. He or she shall deliver to the chair or to the secretary of the unit for delivery to the chair five copies of his or her submission together with the physical evidence and written testimony, if any, supporting the submission. (Physical evidence and written testimony not incorporated physically into a written submission need not be copied but must be delivered in the original to the chair of the unit together with the required copies of the submission.) Failure to deliver the student's written submission to the chair or the secretary of the unit by the end of the tenth business day following the day of filing the Student Grade Appeal Form shall conclude the appeal.
 - e. The chair shall distribute to each member of the panel, the instructor whose grade is being appealed, and the chair's file a copy of the student's written submission and shall make available for examination by the instructor and the panel all of the physical evidence and written testimony submitted separately by the student.

- f. Before the instructor, party to the appeal, shall be invited to respond in writing to the appeal, the panel shall meet to determine whether the student has overcome the presumption that a grade is reasonable by stating and supporting with relevant evidence facts which, if unrebutted, would tend to support the conclusion that the grade was assigned arbitrarily, capriciously ~~or~~, with prejudice or by means of a grading practice that is substantially inconsistent with the discussion of grading practice, if any, in a syllabus.
- g. If the panel finds that the facts stated in the appeal and supported by relevant evidence are insufficient to overcome the presumption, it shall dismiss the appeal at once and so advise the unit chair. Its dismissal shall conclude the appeal.
- h. If the panel finds that the facts stated and supported by relevant evidence are sufficient to overcome the presumption, it shall so advise the unit chair.
- i. The unit chair shall in turn advise the instructor whose grade is being appealed of his or her right to submit to the panel a written response to the student's appeal discussing clearly and concisely the several topics specified in 3.b.1-5 above from the instructor's point of view and offering whatever testimony from self or others or physical evidence or both he or she may have to support his or her claims of fact. The chair shall also advise the instructor of his or her right to seek and obtain, on his or her own, assistance to prepare the response described in this section and any other writings connected with the appeal, provided the source of assistance is not an attorney-at-law.
- j. Within ten business days of receiving the student's written submission and being informed by the chair of the right to respond, the instructor shall deliver five copies of his or her response, if wishing to make one, together with the physical evidence and written testimony, if any, supporting the response to the chair or the unit secretary to deliver to the chair. Failure to deliver the instructor's written response or a written statement of intent not to respond to the chair or the secretary of the unit by the end of the tenth business day following the day of receiving the student's written submission and being informed by the chair of the right to respond shall forfeit the right to respond. The chair shall distribute to each member of the panel, the student appealing and the unit chair's file a copy of the instructor's written response. The chair shall make available for examination by the student and the panel all of the physical evidence and written testimony submitted separately by the instructor.

- k. If the instructor chooses to defend the grade as provided above, the student shall have five business days from the day of receiving the instructor's response to file five copies of a written rebuttal to it in whole or in part with the chair or the secretary of the unit for distribution as above. A student's failure to deliver the written rebuttal by the end of the fifth business day following the day of receiving the instructor's submission shall forfeit the right of rebuttal.
- l. The student and the instructor shall each have the right to submit the written statements of others describing their observations of or their part in transactions pertinent to the appeal. These statements shall become part of the written submissions of the party arranging for them to be written. They shall be submitted by the deadlines governing the submissions of the parties and shall be made available to the panel and the other party by the unit chair. They shall be subject to response or rebuttal as provided in this policy.
- m. Within five business days of the last business day on which a rebuttal by the student might have been filed, the panel shall meet to decide the appeal on the basis of the parties' written submissions and evidence.
- n. It shall base its decision on a preponderance of the evidence in the writings before it.
- o. If, in the course of its deliberation, the panel identifies a lack of information controlled by one or the other of the parties to the appeal before it or by those, if any, writing on their behalf, the panel may invite the parties or either of them to supply in writing the information wanted or to secure it, if possible, from one writing on their behalf. If the panel decides to invite more correspondence with it by the parties or either of them or those writing on their behalf, it shall send a copy of its correspondence with the parties or with either of them to each and every other party to the grade appeal before it. Any party responding in writing to the panel's invitation under this section shall provide a copy of its writing to every member of the panel, the other party to the grade appeal, and the chair's file.
- p. Decision of the appeal shall be by simple majority of the panel in a meeting convened for the purpose of deciding the appeal and attended by every member of the panel.
- q. If decision is for the student appealing, the faculty members of the panel shall determine at once the course grade to be awarded and the reasons for it. The course grade awarded shall be a function of the professional judgment of the faculty members based upon a survey of the evidence of all of the student's work that served as the basis for the

course grade appealed successfully. If the course grade appealed would have been different but for the particular grade assigned to one or another of the pieces of work or instances of performance submitted for a grade and that particular grade was appealed successfully by the student, the faculty members of the panel shall confine their revision of grades to the one or ones successfully appealed and not disturb the others. They shall then assign a course grade consistent with the grades assigned by them and by the instructor where no disturbance of grade was worked by their revision. The grade or grades assigned by the panel may be different from the grade or grades claimed by the student. The student member of the panel shall not participate in determining a grade but may be present as a member of the panel when the determination is made.

- r. Decision of the grade or grades to be awarded in the case of a successful appeal shall require the concurrence of the faculty members of the panel.
- s. Within five business days of deciding the appeal, the panel shall publish to the parties and the unit chair an announcement and explanation of its decision containing:
 - (1) A clear and concise narrative of its understanding of the facts defining the appeal based on the evidence and testimony submitted by the parties. Conflicts of fact shall be resolved by a preponderance of the physical evidence and testimony, including the parties' narratives, before the panel.
 - (2) A clear and concise statement of its understanding of the objections to the disputed grade urged by the student appealing.
 - (3) A clear and concise statement of its decision to accept or reject each objection supported in each instance by a discussion of its reasons for thinking that the facts of the appeal and the text of pertinent University policy support its decision in that instance.
 - (4) If decision is for the student, an announcement of the grade to be awarded in the case and the panel's reasons for it.
- t. The panel shall submit its written decision to the chair of the unit who shall forward it at once to the student and the instructor, with a copy of it and the Student Grade Appeal Form to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- u. If the decision of the panel to change the grade is not accepted by the instructor, the chair of the academic unit shall change the grade as the panel shall have directed.
- v. A summary report of the number of cases heard and the disposition of each case shall be prepared by the Provost and Vice President for

Academic Affairs on an annual basis, and copies forwarded to the President and Faculty Senate.

C. Grade Appeal Deadlines.

from V

1. By the end of the third week of classes of the semester following the one in which the disputed grade was assigned, the student shall have sought informal resolution of the grade dispute by meeting with the instructor.
2. By the end of the fourth week of classes, the student shall have notified the department chair of the failure of his or her unassisted efforts to settle the dispute informally, if failure has occurred.
3. Immediately after notification of failure, the chair shall have scheduled a meeting to review the process with the student.
4. By the end of the fifth week of classes, the scheduled meeting shall have happened.
5. By the end of the sixth week of classes, the chair shall have completed the chair's effort to produce an informal settlement.
6. By the end of the seventh week of classes, the student shall have filed the Student Grade Appeal Form with the chair.
7. By the end of the seventh business day following selection of the grade appeal panel, the panel shall have met to select its chair and begin its work.
8. By the end of the tenth business day following the day of filing the Student Grade Appeal Form, the student shall have delivered his or her written submissions and evidence to the chair.
9. The panel shall meet at once to decide whether the student has overcome the presumption of reasonable grading by the statements of fact and supporting evidence submitted. If the panel decides that the presumption has been overcome it shall at once invite the instructor via the chair of the unit to respond to the student's submission.
10. By the end of the tenth business day following the day of receiving the student's written submission and being informed by the chair of the right to respond, the instructor shall have delivered his or her written response and evidence to the chair.
11. By the end of the fifth business day following the day of receiving the instructor's response, the student shall have delivered his or her rebuttal to that response to the chair.

12. By the end of the fifth business day following the last business day on which a student's rebuttal might have been filed, the panel shall have met to begin to decide the appeal.
13. By the end of the fifth business day following the day on which the panel shall have decided the appeal, the panel shall have published its decision.
14. Having received the panel's written decision, the chair shall have sent it at once to the parties and the Provost.

Note: If every party acts at the last minute, the panel will receive the appeal by the end of the twelfth week of classes. It must begin to deliberate by the end of the thirteenth week. It has five business days following the day of making its decision to publish it.

D. Submissions by Parties.

Student:

1. Student grade appeal form by the student to the chair of the unit in which the disputed grade was assigned—four (4) copies.
2. Written submission explaining the student's position in the dispute by the student to the chair of the relevant unit for delivery to each panelist, the instructor, and the chair's file—five (5) copies.
3. Written statements of witnesses gathered at the choice of the student by the student to the chair of the relevant unit to become part of the student's submission and delivered by the chair to each panelist, the instructor and the chair's file—five (5) copies.
4. Written rebuttal of the instructor's written defense of the disputed grade, if the student chooses to rebut, by the student to the chair of the relevant unit for delivery to each panelist, the instructor and the chair's file—five (5) copies.

Instructor:

1. At the panel's invitation, a written defense of the disputed grade, if the instructor chooses to make one, by the instructor to the chair of the relevant unit for delivery to each panelist, the student and the chair's file—five (5) copies.

2. Written statements of witnesses gathered at the choice of the instructor by the instructor to the chair of the relevant unit to become part of the instructor's submission for delivery to each panelist, the student and the chair's file—five (5) copies.

At the panel's request, a party may submit or cause to be submitted by witnesses further written responses to the panel's request for further information. Five (5) copies of each response to the chair of the relevant unit for delivery to each panelist, the other party and the chair's file.

Each party is required to submit the required number of copies of each document filed by it with the chair of the relevant unit. The unit is required to distribute them as indicated in the Grade Appeal Process. Furthermore, the unit is required to produce copies of the documents created by it in the course of the appeal and to distribute them to the several recipients designated by the Grade Appeal Process.



California State University, Sacramento
900 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819-6036

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MAR 03 2000

February 29, 2000

Faculty Senate Received
413

MEMORANDUM

TO: Associate Vice President David Braverman
Chair, Public Safety Committee

FROM: Donald R. Gerth

I presume you know from publicity and discussion on the campus of the recent assault on a faculty member, Professor Dixon of Chemistry.

This assault has caused Dr. James Hill, the Chair of the Chemistry Department, to request an investigation of the circumstances surrounding the assault and particularly remedial steps that might be taken by the University. I would ask that the Public Safety Committee address this at an early time and forward your conclusions and recommendations to me.

Thank you very much.

DRG/ko

- c. Faculty Senate Chair Bob Buckley
- Professor Dixon
- Professor James Hill
- Provost Jolene Koester
- Vice President Elizabeth Moulds
- Vice President Shirley Uplinger



University Manual

California State University, Sacramento

Policy Name: Public Safety Advisory Committee

Ref:

Effective:

Last Revision Date:

Policy Administrator:

Index cross-references:

Policy File Number: UMP14475

Charge

The University Public Safety Advisory Committee is charged with the task of recommending, to the President of CSUS, policy/policy changes and other issues related to Public Safety which may enhance our campus climate. Recommendations shall address issues of crime prevention, public awareness, policy issues, community issues and any other issues that affect the security, safety and well-being of members of the University community.

The Committee is further charged with the task of making recommendations which will promote greater sensitivity by the CSUS Public Safety Department to the needs of our diverse population. Recommendations should take into consideration the standards and values consistent with Public Safety Officers' duties as campus police and sworn peace officers of the State of California.

Recommendations should also reflect the philosophy that all members of the University community benefit from Public Safety officers' formal and informal involvement in campus life. Public Safety Officers are participating members of the campus community who, through their specific job responsibilities, contribute to making this campus a positive and enriching human environment.

The committee is reminded that while it is within the realm of their charge to recommend policy and to deal with Public Safety issues of general campus concern, this advisory committee will not function as a citizen's review board, oversee specific operations of the department of Public Safety or hear individual grievances. These functions fall within the purview of other procedures.

Membership will be appointed upon receipt of recommendations from appropriate campus organizations.

Public Safety Advisory Committee Members

2 faculty (1 who teaches primarily night classes; 1 who teaches primarily day classes) [recommended by the Academic Senate]
 2 students (1 who lives in the Residence Halls, 1 who takes night classes) [recommended by ASI]
 1 staff (not from Public Safety) [recommended by USA]
 Dean of Students or his designee [convener]
 Public Safety Department representative [selected by Director, Department of Public Safety]
 Civilian community representative [appointed by the President]
 Environmental Health and Safety Director or Designee