

2015-16 FACULTY SENATE
ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MINUTES May 6, 2016
Approved: May 11, 2016

May 8, 2016

Members Present: Bradley, Escobar, Geyer, Gonsier-Gerdin, Hernandez, Hunt, Irwin, Migliaccio, Murphy, Trigales, Van Gaasbeck

Members Absent: Bowie, Gonzalez, Li, Schmidlein, Taylor, Vogt, Watson-Derbigny

Guests Present: Evans, Li, Malroutu, Slabinski, Smith, Wickelgren

Call to Order: Chair Escobar called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

- 1. Approval of the Agenda.** Chair Escobar forgot to ask the Committee about the agenda and the rearrangement of items, but since no one complained or said anything, it was assumed that permission was granted ☺
- 2. Update from the Office of International Programs & Global Engagement (Guest(s): Dave Evans / Frank Li):** Li and Evans provided the Committee with an update on a number of items concerning International Programs & Global Engagement. A handout was sent around, to which folks could refer for specific information. In general, updates were given on the following: enrollment for spring 2016; international student enrollment growth plan; office of international admissions and recruitment (** discussion around changes made to IELTS scores for admissions); expanding study abroad opportunities; hosting research scholars (** involves faculty willing to host someone and buy-in from Chairs and Deans); global engagement certificate (** looking to provide an incentive for students to attend events and activities with international and global engagement focus; will likely need to meet with Curriculum Policies Committee (CPC) since this involves curriculum development and change, though they are welcome to return to APC as well.
- 3. Grade Appeal Policy and Process – President’s Action (Appendix A).** the Committee reviewed this latest version once again, which included edits that were made in response to the inquiries of April 15th. At this meeting, Gerri Smith, former Grade Appeals Manager who was intimately involved with the revisions made to the Senate-approved Grade Appeal Process of 10/1/15, and Emily Wickelgren, current Grade Appeals Manager. While the Committee was fine with the edits that were made, the overwhelming sentiment and desire for the document to go through the formal Senate review process remained the same. It was suggested that when the document returns to the Senate floor, it would be ideal to have a side-by-side comparison, if possible, of the changes that were made, since Senators and others will likely have questions about where changes were made. Since wholesale changes had been made to the document (it is basically a brand new document), it would be difficult to do an exact side-by-side presentation of

changes (e.g., sentence by sentence or paragraph by paragraph). Even showing track changes would be challenging at best.

However, what could be done is to present perhaps a paragraph or section, as well as specifics such as the timelines and deadlines of when the student, the instructor and the grade appeal panels need to submit documentation, etc, and then show where those changes are reflected in the new document. Since this revised document would not be presented to the Senate until sometime next academic year, should the President agree with APC and decide to do this, there would be enough time figure out a clearly discernable way of presenting the manner in which the changes were made.

Chair Escobar volunteered to work with folks in the President's Office over the summer on the presentation of areas or sections in the newly revised Grade Appeal Process which do not reflect a change in substance, only a change in the manner in which the new document is being written... either because she is really dedicated or just plain crazy.... Likely both 😊

A final recommendation was made on April 15th as well as May 6th that President Nelsen could simply sign off on the Amended Grade Appeal Process that was approved by the Faculty Senate in October 2015, knowing that this revised/rewritten Grade Appeal Policy and Process (GAPP) document will be presented to the Faculty Senate once it goes through the formal review process beginning with the policy committee (APC) and moving forward. The Committee felt that this was a reasonable request given that the revised Grade Appeal Process has already gone through an extensive review process beginning in Fall 2013 and ending in October 2015 (2 full years), involving a number of different groups of people including the Working Group (President Gonzalez's Committee to Revise the Grade Appeal Process), APC, the Executive Committee, and finally, the Faculty Senate. Gerri Smith made a valuable comment that, in the future, when revisions are made to a policy such as the Grade Appeal Process, it would be beneficial to have University Counsel examine it *before* it reaches the floor of the Senate. While the Committee agreed with her on that, members felt strongly that since the substantive components of the October 2015 Amended Grade Appeal Process were not problematic and had not been altered in this new version that it is a reasonable request to ask that it be implemented until the new one can be reviewed and subsequently approved. This way, the processes of shared governance could be honored and followed. Likewise, an approved policy that is a significant improvement upon the current, 39-page document could be put into place allowing students to utilize.

The Committee requested that Chair Escobar draft a memo to Senate Chair Bowie that includes these recommendations and asks Chair Bowie to share that with the President.

4. Open Forum: (a) K. Anderegg provided an update on the Advising Task Force. She said that things were going well, that the group was meeting and had created 3 sub-committees, or sub-groups, around some issues of broader concern to the Task Force: Communications Committee; Inventory Committee (to find out what other units/departments are doing on campus and whether efforts are being duplicated); and the Policy Committee (looking at the Advising Policy as well as anything else impacting academic advising). J. Murphy indicated that they could use some additional faculty and welcomed folks to join. Other advising-related issues were raised with respect to the new software coming online (e.g., Smart Planner), specifically the "advising appointment" system. Departments around campus use different methods, and (apparently) there are tools or programs out there that could be used by more than one

department, if not all, which could be accessible by students as well as faculty advisors and staff who make appointments for students. D. Hunt mentioned this and was open to meeting with anyone who was interested in learning more about this.

(b) Chair Escobar provided an update regarding the **Progress to Degree for High Unit Seniors, Establishment of Policy on**. President Nelsen had made a change to the policy that included specific language regarding the roles of the Dean of Undergraduate Students and the Office of the Registrar who are now tasked with identifying and contacting these students as well as working with the major advisor in order to place the student on a plan for graduation and monitor their progress to degree. The Committee referred the item back to the President's Office, requesting clarification of these roles (i.e., were they going to be involved in the advising process or are these roles mostly, or wholly administrative in nature). On May 4, 2016, Chair Escobar met with the Faculty Senate Chair, Sylvester Bowie, as well as President Nelsen and Cely Smart and was informed that the role of the Office of the Registrar would be to provide reports upon request regarding these students with more than 150 units earned and no progress to degree being made and that the role of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies was to contact the student, as well as the major advisor, to follow up and ensure that the student was following the plan as prescribed by the advisor. They were not to have advising roles. Following the update, the Committee agreed to the changes made by President Nelsen. Chair Escobar will follow up with Senate Chair Bowie for him to convey the Committee's feedback and support of the policy as it is now written.

5. Minutes for April 15, 2016 Reviewed. Minutes approved (unanimous)

6. Review of APC 2015-16 Final Report (Separate File): Chair Escobar sent out a draft of the final report just a few hours prior to the meeting, so many folks on the Committee were not able to review it nor provide any feedback. Chair Escobar indicated that she would update the report with information from today's meeting and send out to the Committee, along with the minutes, seeking their input or feedback (if any). Additionally, Chair Escobar will send the report to the Executive Committee to see what it would like to do with it at this point.

7. Drop Policy (Appendix C). The Drop Policy presented to the Committee included changes from GSPC. It was suggested that the additional language with reference to graduate and credential students was confusing and that GSPC should draft a separate policy concerning drops and withdrawals for graduate and credential students if would like to do so. K. Trigales mentioned that the campus drop and withdrawal policy, as well as course adds, census date, etc., apply to ALL students (undergraduate and graduate students alike). So, there was some confusion as to why graduate students needed to be specifically mentioned. The Committee also discussed the issue with respect to the assignment of a W grade to any student who is enrolled in a Field Trip Course and who encounters a challenge with the course and needs to withdraw from it. Chair Escobar did not provide the Committee with a copy of the Senate-approved Field Trip Policy, so it was difficult for some folks to fully understand how the change would be made to the Drop Policy and what exactly that change needed to be. Additional questions and concerns raised included: at what point in the semester are we talking about (i.e., after the 4th week? 7th week? Last 3 weeks of the semester?) and what are the implications of allowing for late withdrawals and exceptions

beyond what is specified in the current drop and withdrawal policy as it relates to EO 1037. Chair Escobar pointed out that a student could probably make a case for a withdrawal from a Field Trip Course under the current policy since the language specified is fairly broad (i.e., medical circumstances beyond the student's control). This way, the language of the drop and withdrawal policy, nor the language that defines a W grade, would need to be altered, thereby keeping in step with the provisions of EO 1037. Along these lines, D. Geyer reminded the Committee that EO 1037 trumps campus policy; while campus policy can be *more* restrictive than EO 1037, campus policy cannot go beyond the scope of what is allowed in EO 1037. This item most definitely will be continued and carried over into the 2016-2017 academic year.

8. Meeting Schedule for Spring 2016

~~February 5~~
~~February 19~~
~~March 4~~

~~March 18~~
~~April 1~~
~~April 15~~

~~May 6~~

3. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.

Sue C. Escobar, Committee Chair