

Academic Standards Committee (ASC) Minutes		October 26, 2018	
		1:37 pm	
		International Pavilion Room 101A	
Meeting called by: Ian Wischmeier, Chair	Academic Standards Committee	Type of meeting:	ASC
Facilitators:	Ian Wischmeier	Note taker:	Daniella Watson
<p>Attendees: Cindy Anderson, Dan Stoffel, Daniella Watson, Glenn Hansen, Ian Wischmeier, John Georgas, Kathy Savage, Kyle Winfree, Margaret Dunfee, Ronni Marks, Samantha Callahan, Tarang Jain, Terry Crites and Victoria Pickett.</p> <p>Participated by phone: Nicole Hampton, Rosalicia Cordova, Stephenie Jerome, and Pam Anastassiou.</p> <p>Excused by email: Alma Sandigo, Courtney Luque, John Masserini, Luke Plonsky, Mohamed Mohamed, Patty Horn and Pete Yanka.</p> <p>Absent: Camarin Porter, Jaime Smith, Michael Kallsen, and Pamela Powell</p> <p>Guests: Terri Hayes, Lucy Hegg</p>			
<i>Call to Order</i>			
Agenda Item: 1	Call To Order	Presenter:	Ian Wischmeier
<p>Ian Wischmeier called the meeting to order at 1:37 p.m. He announced the topics on the agenda for review, approval and discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He announced that Terri and Lucy will talk about the Grade Replace Grade Appeal Policy. The Policy was presented last year. There was not a quorum to vote on and there was a change with constituents. • The Grade Appeal edits Nicole and John Georgas worked on. • The September 28 minutes need to be voted on. 			
<i>ASC Business</i>			
Agenda Item: 2	Approval of Minutes	Presenter:	Ian Wischmeier
Ian asked if everyone approve the September 28 minutes. Minutes was approved			
Agenda Item: 3	Grade Repeat Grade Appeal Policy	Presenter	Terri Hayes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Grade Repeat Practice Proposal: Recap <p>Ian did a re-cap of what that proposal entails.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a second request on this policy to look at this process also in conjunction with the Academic Probation Suspension Policy and with the Grade Repeat Policy. • A detailed comparison chart on "Probation Policy Breakdown" and "Grade Repeat Breakdown" were provided. • The committee made the decision to review this policy in context of Grade Repeat Policy and Probation/Suspension 			

Ian reminded the committee that this policy was vetted and voted on last year. There was not a quorum to vote a "Yes" or "No" on it. Technically, it would be up for a vote this time; however, with the different representation with the two new colleges, voting on this policy would not actually have an accurate representation, to make this decision.

Ian shared a brief PowerPoint presentation on the Grade Replace Grade Appeal Policy that included the following:

- **Probation/Suspension**
 - Academic Probation is assigned when an undergraduate student cumulative GPA is below 2.0
 - To continue on Academic Probation a student must earn a term GPA of 2.0
 - A student is in Good Academic Standing and no longer on Probation when the cumulative GPA is at least 2.0
 - A student on Probation that earns a term GPA of less than 2.0 is suspended from NAU
 - The student must complete 2.5 GPA and 12 units from another institution to be considered for Reinstatement
- **Reinstatement**
 - 12 units of academic coursework completed at another institution with at least a 2.5 cumulative grade point average or
 - A documented explanation of extenuating circumstances that resulted in their past poor academic performance and evidence that those circumstances have been resolved.
- **Grade Repeat Policy**
 - Students may only repeat courses in which a grade of "D" or "F" was earned
 - Students are permitted to do only one (1) repeat per course
 - A second repeat may be permitted upon completion of a petition
 - Higher of repeated grades is used in the Cumulative GPA
- **Grade Repeat Process**
 - Grade is replaced to the original term of completion updating the (a) Term GPA (b) CUM GPA
 - Academic Standing does not change to preserve academic history
 - The proposed procedure change is to allow a student to continue on Academic Probation if the cumulative GPA is 2.0 or higher in the term the grade replacement occurred.

Visual were provided showing:

- The current process: when a student is suspended
- Proposed practice change: The student would persist at NAU

Probation/Suspension Summary:

- Review peer institutions, UofA and ASU has same policy as NAU in three categories:
 - Provides students a minimum of 2 terms prior to being suspended
 - Provides students a minimum of 2 terms prior to being suspended, but a time limit to return to be in Good Academic Standing
- Other school policies than NAU
 - A student is permitted to attend 3 terms before suspension
 - Instead of suspension, a stop out is required:
 - 1 stop out is required if a term GPA is below 2.0
 - If an additional term GPA below is 2.0 after returning from the stop out then the student is fully suspended/dismissed

Institutions in each category: Graphs showing Academic Probation/Continuation Policy Summary and Institution comparison on Grade Repeat Limit Summary

- They reflect the Probation Comparison of the Grade Repeat Policy and of this practice.

The committee asked several questions on the Grade Appeal Grade Repeat Policy. The overall issues were:

- Students who are replacing a grade have GPA changed (based on outcome of the grade), but standing is not changed.
- Students on probation, who replace their grade, may see an improvement to a prior term GPA, but not a corresponding change to standing.
- Discussion about how to support students who are making steps to improve their standing, but might be eligible for suspension due to their standing remaining unchanged after a grade replace.

Agenda Item: 3

The Grade Appeal edits to
Policy 100105

Presenter:

Nicole
Hampton
John Gorgas

Nicole Hampton and John Georgas worked on this policy edits to ensure that the student is included in all steps whether the appellant switches from student to instructor. During this edit more inconsistencies were found and more revisions were necessary.

Edits to be made to Step 3:

- Student and instructor meet and then in Step 2 the student, the instructor and the designated administrator meet.
- Change all "instructor" to "faculty member".
- Keep the language of "appellant" but make it clear that whoever was appealing Step 2 to designate if it is the student or the faculty member and indicate that the college dean or designee to notify all parties.
- A statement of issues will be provided within 5 business days.
- Modifications to be added in the language related to the number of days for the process.
- Clarification of who is the appellant and who is the respondent and all parties involved in the matter other than the Step 2 appellant could present written responses to the statement of issues.
- The appellant and respondent will be changed to all parties.
- Any request for information by any of the parties needs to go to the dean or designee 10 days before the appeal meeting.
- If a dean or designee consider any requests to be confidentiality issues they will seek out the advice of the appropriate Vice Provost.
- All the materials will be given to the committee.
- The committee receives the materials no later than 2 business days prior to the meeting (that was already in the policy).
- During the meeting only 15 minutes will be granted to each party who want to have an opportunity to participate.
- The appellant and respondent will change to parties to indicate who is presenting when.
- The Step 2 appellant will get a 15 minute time limit as well as any party wishing to respond.
- There is a 5 minute time limit for the committee to ask questions
- A closing statement will be added for the Step 2 appellant to make sure that student gets the last word if the student is appealing.
- The students are allowed to provide as much written documentation as they want.
- Will clean up the language how the information is recorded.
- The letter is sent out to all the parties not just to the appellant.
- The respondent will indicate the decision of the committee.

- A Step 3 appellant will be added keeping the same language as in Step 2 appellant.
- No changes need in the definitions section. They look fine the way they were written.
- Under special circumstances: if a faculty is on sabbatical or not available their chair will take on the role of the faculty. It needs to be specify very clearly in the policy that if the chair takes over the faculty role their findings are not the findings of the Step 1 but rather of the Step 2. (An alternate interpretation might be that the chair pretends to be the faculty and whatever ruling they issue is the Step 1).
- A Step 4 (Appealing the ASC Ad Hoc Committee Decision) will be added.
- Kyle, John and Nicole will be working on the re-write of the policy.

Re-write the policy:

Ian asked the committee members if this version of the policy was good enough to make the change in the short term so they have this occurring without students being involved in that Step 3 process and possibly Step 4?

Outcome: Go forward with these changes for now.

Currently the policy says when the step 3 occurs and the faculty member appeals (the chair) the student is left out of the process and the student does not have a voice.

Next piece will be a sub-committee to continue looking at this re-write policy and send an update to Ian by next meeting. Get the full re-write approved before the end of Spring academic year. Maybe get a representation from the general counsel office who is familiar with writing policies. Mark Grisham's name came up.

Ian asked a motion to make just the changes for all "parties" language and to include in that motion Cindy's edit that the chair can set the time limit. Motion passed.

Agenda Item: 4	Announcements	Presenter:	Ian Wischmeier
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No announcements were made. 			
Agenda Item: 5	Good Of the Order	Presenter:	Ian Wischmeier
Agenda Item: 6	Adjournment	Presenter:	Ian Wischmeier
Motion to adjourn the meeting. Approved. Meeting adjourned at 1:35pm			