

Academic Standards Committee (ASC) Minutes		March 29, 2019	
		1:35 pm	
		BAC 206	
Meeting called by: Ian Wischmeier, Chair	Academic Standards Committee	Type of meeting:	ASC
Facilitators:	Ian Wischmeier	Note taker:	Daniella Watson
<p>Attendees: Courtney Luque, Daniella Watson, Dan Stoffel, Ian Wischmeier, John Georgas, John Masserini, Kevin Gemoets, Kyle Winfree, Margaret Dunfee, Michael Kallsen, Mohamed Mohamed, Nicole Hampton, Pam Anastassiou, Samantha Callahan, Tarang Jain, Terry Crites, and Victoria Pickett.</p> <p>Participated by phone: Amanda Cornelius, Calvin Legassie, Camarin Porter, Jamie Smith, Pamela Powell, Patty Horn, Rosalicia Cordova, Samantha Callahan, and Stephenie Jerome.</p> <p>Excused by email: Glenn Hansen, Kathy Savage, Margaret Dunfee, Pamela Powell, Ronni Marks, Rosalicia Cordova, and Tarang Jain.</p> <p>Guests: Chelsea Bergner (University Advising) representing Glenn Hansen, Katie Burke (ASNAU) representing, Lela Montfort and Terri Hayes</p>			
<i>Call to Order</i>			
Agenda Item: 1	Call To Order	Presenter:	Ian Wischmeier
Ian Wischmeier called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. He asked everyone present and the members on the phone to introduce themselves.			
<i>ASC Business</i>			
Agenda Item: 2	Approval of Minutes	Presenter:	Ian Wischmeier
Ian asked everyone if they had an opportunity to review the minutes and had any feedback on the March 15 minutes. No feedback. Motion was made. Minutes approved.			
Agenda Item: 3	Academic Integrity Policy 100601	Presenter:	John Masserini
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Masserini said that the policy was reviewed by Mark Grisham and the General Counsel's office in terms of the legal aspect of it. • He made the edits that were discussed at the March 15 meeting. • Removed the change from "is it student faculty first, is it student, faculty chair first and it was decided that everyone will go through the same process. • He cleaned up some of the links. • What he found was that there is not a policy that addresses suspension and expulsion because of Academic reasons other than a GPA below 2.0 • Everything aligns now and he took out some redundant language. • The composition issue was addressed. John said that it was best to pull out the process from the policies so that when this is done for the first time next year we will see that there were some snags. • We can look at it as a committee and change the processes and not have to worry about being an official policy approval. • John said that the first meeting of the Academic Integrity materials training went very well. 			

- Barbara sent out a second draft to folks. It should get wrapped up in about 2-3 meetings and over the summer everything will be put in place.
- There will be modules for everyone and it will give the students a consistent experience.

Comments/Concerns/Questions: Under the student responsibilities - #4: Student shall report any known violations of the academic integrity policy.

- Do we provide any protection for that student to remain anonymous in this process to protect them?
- Are we getting ourselves limited by what we say and what we don't say, what's implied or what's not implied?
- John questioned whether that needs to be in the policy or do we do it as part of the training? He will run it by legal to see what they say for due process for the accused.

Question: OnBase work flow management system:

- A lot of things have been put on hold. It is primarily because of the PeopleSoft 9.2 upgrade.
- John spoke with Mikhael regarding keeping the routing form. He cannot promise one by next year but the following year for sure.
- It will be part of the training material for faculty.

Question: Does that belong in the policy or in training? Training.

- It could be reworded to say "student should report any perceived or known or observed". John will work on the language. If next year we see it becomes an issue, we can address it more in the policy, itself.
- Then the professor goes and does their own diligence.
- It will be an important piece to bring to the training.
- From a Code of Conduct perspective "shall" "should" expects student to do this as part of the ethical professional community or is it more of a should? Probably a "should".
- Students as such are not mandatory reporters. A resident assistant would be a mandatory reporter.
- Would want to encourage a reporting environment but provide some protection for the students.
- If there was a lead that could be further explored, checked out, but keeping that source confidential so we could encourage more ethical reporting.
- When we do the training for the students can we include that role as being a reporter?
- The module that is being prepared for the students will be refreshed completely and updated from what we have right now, but it is not going to be a sanction anymore.
- It will be part of the education that faculty can use to give to the students right away.
- It was brought up that ITS training module is a great one to model. Consider some of the ways they approach those topics when working on the Academic Integrity modules.

Ian asked that if we vote on this today will it be implemented at the end of the semester or the start of the fall semester.

- Start of the fall semester.

In the policy it does indicate that due to the academic calendars, more than likely, unless under extreme situations these will be implemented in fall and spring not summer. Same language use in the Grade Appeal Policy.

Discussion: Page 6, #3: Regarding faculty and student: Reading as the student faculty meeting has to then either reverse/modify or uphold their decision and do not get the opportunity to then consult with others...technically, it's the conclusion.

- All this is doing is allowing the student their due process.

It does not describe what that third outcome is?

- John took out the dependent clause: “If the student disputes the recommendation of the faculty member, the student may review”.
- John would like to leave it as the “final recommendation”. It still allows the student to say “no”. John will make that change to make it consistent.

3: If the student is not admitting it and the faculty member is still recommending?

- The key is allowing the student that once a final recommendation has been made we need to allow the student an opportunity to ask for a review of that decision and allow them due process.

#2: If the student admits guilt it’s going to get reviewed by administration, regardless vs. # 3. If a student doesn’t admit it and the faculty member imposes a sanction but the student doesn’t request it to go any further, there is no administrative review.

Why would the faculty review when the student admits it but not when the student doesn’t? Lots of discussions.

- John said that once the sanction leaves the faculty it goes to the Chair, the Chair reviews it with the Associate Dean to look for priors and that recommendation goes to the Associate Dean and the Associate Dean who makes the final decision.
- Based upon the way the policy is written it looks like only underneath condition #2 it is going to the Chair to review the violation and sanction and make a recommendation to the Associate Dean, that wouldn’t happen at level 3 unless the student appeal the decision.
- If we had some verbiage from #2 also from #3 it would make it clearer.
- No, 3 is something different. It is when a student disputes and wants a review.
- Maybe it should say “if the student disputes the recommendation and requests a review”.
- If a review is requested by the student it goes to the next step just like in a grade appeal. But if they don’t request a review it’s not going to that next step.
- If they don’t request a review it falls under #2.
- Why does A & B need to be under 2?
- After #3, if they get the review then you look at outcomes of meeting faculty/student and Chair Director that falls under #2.
- It has to go to the next level for review and the outcome of that dictates ok, is it done now and we said that this is the sanction.
- If that is the case then all the other stuff has to happen. If not, there is another level of review. That’s why it stops at the Associate Dean level. This is predicted on allowing students their due process. Once there is a sanction it gets reviewed by the administration.

Question: Does a faculty member has the right to appeal? Answer: No. The faculty member and Chairs do not have the right to appeal because their decision is from the stance of the institution.

- The only person who has the right to appeal is the individual in which the action is being taken upon which is the student.
- We, as faculty, Chairs and even Associate Deans are acting as agent of the institution and we cannot appeal our own decisions.
- This was the conversation John had with legal and that is why it was taken out of the grade appeal and that is why it needs to be taken out of this Academic Integrity Policy.
- We cannot have 3 appeals, only 1 appeal and that is at the Associate Dean level.

As a faculty member what is my due process against academic sanctions? The issue with the policy from before is that there was no academic oversight from a more global level.

- Faculty have oversight from their Chairs, Associate Deans and Deans oversee them and make decisions. This policy does not preclude these conversations happening to your Associate Dean. We cannot make that sanction in the policy because if someone does not make that phone call then we are not following our own policies.

- There are channels in place for faculty to go report who are completely sequestered from, like the Ombudsman that deal with this cultural issues.
- This policy is about the student, not the faculty.

Ian asked if the committee should vote.

It was moved to approve with the changes discussed. John will make all the changes discussed in the meeting.

Clarification: An Associate Dean put something in place for proper recording if a student is in their last semester found a violation a proper recording says now it's in place and then later the student can still ask for a reversal through the hearing board for that appeal. Right!

Suggestions: What's missing there is: If the Associate Dean's decision does not agree with the faculty member's then the Associate Dean is going to make the final decision on what the sanctions are going to be. Yes. It's not in there as another number.

Adding that wording addresses all the concerns. The Deans make the final decision whether there's a dispute or not because the Chair is recommended. Somehow, that review includes: here is the faculty opinion, here's the Chairs opinion and the Dean will make a final decision. Take out the part before the comma and that makes it clear. John will remove that clause.

John will add: Any recommendations made at any point of the process, rendered decisions, and ensure proper recording.

Ian asked if we had a motion to first or second. All in favor. Motion passed. We have a new policy. John thanked everyone.

Ian told the committee that there is a flowchart that goes along with this policy on the Library policies.

Mark Grisham is working on a supplemental materials to go with every policies.

Agenda Item: 4	The First Year Attendance Policy (100037) and Student Institutional Excuses Policy (100226)	Presenter	Nicole Hampton Michael Kallsen Kevin Gemoets
----------------	---	-----------	--

The group met on March 28 and had a good discussion. They decided that they needed more information before moving forward with it. They could not find any other attendance policies other than the two they have. They didn't know if anyone had any background on previous policies.

Looking at the date of the policy the thought was that historically, Laurie Dickson or Melinda Trembl's group, as part of the re-accreditation, might have actually collected some data on this. There should at least be one report of data that a group might be able to look at when revising the policy.

The class missed memo:

- There are instances where faculty are requiring students to have classes missed-memo and that's not what classes missed-memos are supposed to be for.
- Then we have the Institutional Excuses.
- The faculty need to make their own attendance policies.
- A frame will be provided as to how to work within what the institution says about attendance.

- It would also be a good idea to revisit the perspective in the attendance policies.
- It talks about attendance being assessed.
- Attendance is not a learning outcome or an assessment. It's a vehicle for learning.
- We don't access attendance. We assess learning.

Suggestion was made to have an ancillary document that isn't part of the policy and an attempt to keep the policy clean but is the best practice documents.

- What is mentioned in the institutional excuses area is that faculty need to identify what their policy is in the syllabus and that is not clear in the policy.
- The syllabus policy (100227) says the faculty will follow the template.
- The template briefly mentions one of the thing to include is attendance.
- The institutional excuse policy says that the faculty must clearly state whatever their policy is in the syllabus and present to the student the first week of class whether it's an online policy or in person.
- It is not in the attendance policy.
- The policy was not clear on how to do attendance.
- It needed to be clearly communicated in the syllabus and the students needed to be aware of the policy.

Question: Is there an automatic drop from the class if a student is not attending?

- It was recommended to keep in mind, when revising the policies, that the International students have to have 12 credits minimum to maintain their immigration status.
- It would also be helpful if there were some way to better inform students of the attendance policy (referring to the administrative drop policy which is a different policy).
- Drop notifications are helpful to follow up with the students who have decided not to return to the university or have decided not to come to the university but have enrolled in a full course.
- It is helpful to dis enroll those students from their classes, so they don't have a bill later that they never knew they had.
- The international students are not always aware that they have to attend classes; that they are on the wait list for and they get dropped from the wait list.

Please feel free to provide some more input to the group.

The group feel that they have enough information from the feedback/suggestions to work on the policy and bring it to the April 29th meeting. Nicole gave a timeline for the first draft at the September meeting. John Georgas will join the group to help put the policy together.

- One feedback from page 1: "he" "she" should be more gender neutral. John will clean them up.
- Classes missed-memos are going away. They will ONLY be used for extreme emergency situations.
- The faculty will need to be alerted that the classes missed-memos will be going away in the fall.

Some concerns were brought up for students who can get documentation in the community if it is required by a faculty member whereas other students using the campus health do not have access to such documentation.

Kevin Gemoets will check on the policy from the website to verify if campus health provide documentation. He will meet with them to express the concerns and ask them to re-examine what they records they might be able to provide for the students.

Feedback: Documentations can be found on line now showing that a student had an appointment at HLC and a screen shot can be taken for reference.

Agenda Item: 5	Fulltime Enrollment Proposal (100316) (during Summer Term)	Presenter:	Michael Kallsen
----------------	--	------------	-----------------

The “Fulltime Enrollment Proposal (100316) is being reviewed to vet with the constituents and be voted on at the May meeting.

- Modifications were made a year ago and now proposing fulltime enrollment during Summer Term.
- The current policy says:
 - “When new international students want to enroll on campus for their first time in a summer session they need to be enrolled in 12 units.
 - Proposing to change to 6 units for summer enrollment and be counted as fulltime to ensure student success.
 - **Reference:** U of A, has 6 units; ASU each 4 units. Feels that 6 units was appropriate.
 - **Question:** is the unit count concurrent or cumulative? Since summer is counted as a term it’s cumulative over the entire summer.
 - International students cannot count only courses.
 - They have to be in-person courses or hybrid courses. 3 units could be on-line.
 - Even if we drop to 6; 3 units could be on-line.
 - It’s hard to find in-person classes in the summer.
 - **Question:** Was financial aid contacted? Yes.
 - This is separate from financial aid policy? Yes.
 - This is for fulltime status as enrolled at the university.
 - This does not include fulltime status when it comes to federal regulations that deal with financial aid: types of grants, awards, you may be awarded that are outside the university.
 - Is there a reason we are limiting to just international students?
 - The international students are not allowed visas unless they are categorized by the university as fulltime.
 - Therefore, if they want to come and start their summer, they can’t, they have to come in the fall.
 - This allows them to come in the summer because they are considered fulltime by the university.
 - **Suggestion:** Put a space after summer term and add “fulltime is determined”.
 - In general there are no international students in the summer.
 - **Reasons:** no way to track the enrollment and it would be great labor intensive.
 - Students who would come in the summer wouldn’t have the support.
 - This would be intended for students who have special support available to them like: athletics.
 - It’s not intended for every student, International students are never allowed to start in the summer.
 - For academic re-instatement, as well, particularly when it’s 12 credits because a student returning after suspension coming back with academic re-instatement 12 credit in the summer is way too many credits.

Ian asked for a motion? Move to approve. All in favor. Motion approved to revise and send to ASC to vet.

Agenda Item: 6	Grade Change Process		Lela Montfort
----------------	----------------------	--	---------------

- Lela brought visual to explain how the Grade Change Process works. She wanted to make it clear that this is not changing the policy only proposing to change the practice.
- Currently, when a student is on probation (CUM GPA below 2.0), and if their term GPA does not reach 2.0 they get suspended.

- The practice would be:
 - For a student on probation CUM GPA below 2.0 and had a term below 2.0. - suspended as in previous practice
 - If their previous term cum GPA is above 2.0 after grade replace, the suspension is not applied and the student gets one more term.
 - If those students who were in grade replace and their grade replace got applied, their cum GPA for the previous term went above a 2.0 technically, they are in good standing.
 - If their cum GPA is not below a 2.0 NAU will give them 1 more term.

Transcripts are not changing.

- **A letter is sent out to students with the following:**
 - According to the NAU policy, you are eligible for suspension as a result of your fall grade. However, this term you were enrolled in one or more grade replace courses. The recalculation of your previous term GPA with grade replacement has resulted in a previous term cum GPA of 2.0 or above and therefore, NAU has opted not to apply the suspension and to place you on probation.
- If: an automated report is not able to be created in time, until it is created, Lela will have a report pulled for those students who did grade replace and she will manually do this.
- She is hoping that after the PeopleSoft updates are done there will be a chance in the next year to 2 years there will be the ability to have the report automated.
- Does “w” grades fall into the Grade Replace? No. the policy allows for “D” and “F.
- Note for Lela to change: Registrars calculation. It’s not a registrar’s calculation. It’s a system calculation.
- Ian asked for a decision and feedback from the committee.
- A motion for Lela to edit “Registrars calculation” that it’s not a registrar’s calculation. It’s a system calculation.
- Lela will add her contact information on the back of the proposal as it is getting vetted for people to contact her with questions.
- Ian asked to move to vet. Motion approved.
- Lela will return to the April 26th meeting with feedback and will vote on it.

Agenda Item: 7	New Chair and Vice Chair		Ian Wischmeier
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ian told the ASC members about the New Chair and Vice Chair elect. • He asked the ASC Committee members to email Daniella Watson if they would like to be Chair or nominate someone. • He also mentioned that a Vice Chair elect is needed. It would be a great opportunity to be a backup as the Vice Chair elect. • Next year, will be Ian’s 3rd year as Chair. • We’ll vote on the New Chair and Vice Chair elect at the April 26th meeting. • Nicole had a request from her College on the three policies that John sent out for their review. • Request was to send the track changes document so they can see what changes were cleaned up. • John suggested they go look at the policies. The original policy number is at the top and there was one substance of change. The rest was cutting things out that were redundant and rearranged. 			
Agenda Item: 8	Announcements		Ian Wischmeier

No announcements.			
Agenda Item: 9	Good To Order	Presenter:	Ian Wischmeier
Nothing for Good to Order.			
Agenda Item: 10	Adjournment	Presenter:	Ian Wischmeier
Motion to adjourn the meeting. Approved. Meeting adjourned at 3:05pm. Ian reminded Jaime Smith to email Michael Kallsen her feedback about the Summer Enrollment Policy. After Michael makes the revision incorporating Jaime's comments and makes it clearer, it will go out to the whole group for vetting.			