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2016-17 Meeting #1 Notes
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3rd Fl. Common Space, 86 Wentworth Street
NOTE TAKER: Burke

Von Bakanic
Deborah Boyle
Quinn Burke - Chair
Bob Mignone
Scott Peeples
Rebecca Shumway
Ricard Viñas-de-Puig
Ted Carrigan Broda (student rep)
Shannon McKenzie (Academic Affairs)
Michelle Futrell (Academic Affairs)
Lynn Cherry (Associate Provost)

AGENDA

1. Introductions
   a. Burke introduced himself; FCAS members and Academic Affairs representatives
      introduced themselves

2. FCAS “Rules of the Road” (see below)
   (see below for overview)

3. FCAS OAKS page
   a. Burke gave a brief overview of accessing the FCAS page (e.g., “SPECUGAS”)
      under the “Student” access tab at at OAKS

4. Current Petitions
   a. Currently 6 Late Withdrawal petitions posted; 3 Senior Coursework Elsewhere
      petitions posted; Burke noted that the History Dept. Chair had contacted him about
      student J.M. and an urgency to this request

5. Other Academic Matters
   a. Burke noted that over the 2016-17 year, FCAS’ responsibilities have expanded from
      reviewing student petitions to vetting wider academic issues, such as the College’s
      major GPA policy, course syllabi requirements, time conflict registration. Forms, & a
      potential course exclusion policy. This expanded role is to continue in 2016-17
   b. Assoc. Provost Cherry noted that if one was to return to FCAS’ original charge, the
      Committee was not simply tasked with academic matters but with admissions and
      financial aid as well, and this is a consideration going forward.
      i. Burke inquired whether the committee’s relationship with Academic Affairs
         in this regard is to (a) make recommendations or (b) make actual decisions
         for Academic Affairs to act upon; in this regard Assoc. Provost Cherry
         indicated that it would depend on the matter/issue itself
      ii. Mignone noted that in the past FCAS has largely been a reactive committee;
         vetting issues/proposal brought to them by Academic Affairs or the Student
         Government Association (as with last academic year)
   c. Assoc. Provost Cherry noted that an upcoming issue for FCAS to be aware of relates
      to graduate admission policies; for undergraduate admission, students apply to the
      College; for graduate admission, students apply to the individual program itself and
accordingly the individual graduate programs set admission requirements. There is evidence that individual programs have changed admission requirements in the past without a wider review from the College.

i. Mignone inquired whether these proposed admission changes in the past were proposed and voted upon in Graduate Council?

ii. Assoc. Provost Cherry indicated that in some instances, yes, but in other instances, there is no evidence of a formal vote

Meeting Adjourned at 4:55 PM

FCAS “Rules of the Road”

Voting

iii. The committee is currently made up of 7 CofC faculty members and 1 CofC undergraduate and relies on a “super-majority” of 6 members (minimum) to approve or reject an appeal online.

iv. In the case of any cases that do not have at least 6 FCAS members voting in agreement online, the committee will meet to discuss the case in person. A simple majority vote (e.g., at least 5 members in agreement) suffices when the committee meets in person.

v. FCAS members are asked to include a brief statement of reason (1-2 sentences) explaining their rationale for rejecting or approving a petition; in order to avoid repetition, the FCAS member can simply cite another FCAS’ member reasoning here.

vi. As a committee, FCAS can also offer feedback to the student about their petition which will then be provided to the student by UAS staff.

vii. For withdrawals and for senior coursework elsewhere petitions, the committee does not email students directly or engage students with regard to decisions.

viii. When asking for additional documentation, the committee does not ask the student directly but instead asks UAS staff for the information.

d. Late Withdrawal Petitions

i. Please review the “Guidelines for FCAS 2016-17” for an overview of what circumstances warrant (and which circumstances do not warrant) Late course Withdrawal.

ii. Selective Withdrawal petitions are nearly unanimously rejected unless, in the rare instance, there are particular circumstances that specifically affect only selective courses.

1. Selective withdrawal is allowed with Express coursework as this type of coursework is considered apart from courses taken within the traditional College calendar.

iii. If a student petitions to withdraw from multiple semesters’ coursework, if the same reason is given for all semesters, the committee typically denies the request.
iv. FCAS decisions are final and cannot be appealed; students however may appeal FCAS decisions to senior Academic Affairs staff.

v. In general, military-related requests are honored by FCAS

e. Senior Coursework Elsewhere Petitions
   i. Students must have earned at least 30 credit hours in residence at the College of Charleston by the time they graduate.
   
   ii. No more than 7 of the last 37 hours may be completed at another institution.
   
      iii. Students need to have maintained at least a 2.0 cumulative GPA and a 2.0 major GPA.
   
      iv. In general, financial reasons are NOT sufficient for over and above the 7 hours
   
      v. In general, military-related requests are honored by FCAS
FCAS Committee Meeting, 9/14/16

Minutes of Academic Standards Committee
September 14, 2016
3:00 pm School of Education, Dean’s Conference Room

In attendance: Bakanic, Boyle, Burke (Chair), Mignone, Peeples, Shumlay, Viñas-de-Puig; Broda (student representative); Futrell (ex-officio), McKenzie (ex-officio).

Minutes taken by Viñas-de-Puig

Meeting started at 3.05pm.

Committee convened in Dean’s Conference Room, School of Education; Viñas-de-Puig was nominated to be secretary.

1. Minutes of previous FCAS meeting
The minutes of the FCAS meeting held on August 31, 2016 were approved unanimously.

2. Information on OneEarth and iTEP
Burke introduced Su Frost and Penny Aber-Khan who gave a presentation on OneEarth and iTEP to the committee.

2a. OneEarth
Frost indicated that OneEarth will be added to the list of the external evaluators used to assess the requirements met by students who transfer to CofC from an international school. This evaluating system provides certain advantages, including a more personal connection with the assessing company and a maintenance of the entrance requirements for students.

Mignone inquired about the type of students this service was addressed to. Frost responded that this service is used to assess the academic history of any student, from high-school to graduate school. However, this service is not used to make any decision on the transfer of courses, as this remains a faculty matter. Burke asked how many evaluating agencies are used and the reason behind adding OneEarth to the list of external evaluators already used by CofC. Frost responded that there are one 6-7 agencies operating in the US and OneEarth was considered after directly contacting CofC and offering a more personable exchange with CofC Office of Admissions than other agencies (e.g. World Education Services –WES).

2b. iTEP
Aber-Khan mentioned that CofC currently accepts TOEFL and IELTS as the evaluating tools to measure the English proficiency level of incoming international students. iTEP will be added to the list of accepted English proficiency exams, as it offers significant advantages, including but not limited to a higher standard of exam security (since every single is randomized and visually recorded), shorter time for
each exam, and reduced pricing. Aber-Khan also indicated that this proficiency exam is becoming more popular in certain parts of Asia (China, India) and Europe (Italy). Some committee members questioned what specific points this exam focuses on, given its shorter time. Aber-Khan responded that both content and grammar are assessed, with some parts being automatically assessed.

At the end of the presentations, Burke indicated that FCAS does not necessarily need to pass any formal vote on the implementation by CofC of either OneEarth or iTEP. However, Burke, Mignone, and Peeples expressed some reservations, that might need to be taken into consideration if a formal vote on these assessment services needs to be made by FCAS.

3. College-wide Major GPA Policy:
Given the restrictions on time, Burke indicated that the revision of the College-Wide Major GPA Policy will be tabled until the next FCAS meeting. Regarding this issue, Mignone suggested the creation of a cross-campus forum to discuss the possibilities regarding the major GPA policy and that the role of FCAS should be to make a recommendation on the major GPA policy to the Faculty Senate. Burke added that the Office of the Registrar should have a say on the implementation of the major GPA policy.

4. Vote on pending requests
4a. Late Withdrawal Petitions
   • Student JR: Denied by unanimous decision.
   • Student ACB: Approved by unanimous decision.
   • Student FS: Request for additional information, as there is no evidence on why the withdrawal date of March 18 was not met by the student.
   • Student SC: This matter does not concern FCAS; Request for medical documentation.
   • Student DG: Approved by unanimous decision.

4b. Course Elsewhere Petitions
   • Student VH: Denied by unanimous decision.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:15pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ricard Viñas-de-Puig
FCAS Committee Meeting, 9/28/16

Attending: Viñas de Puig, Bakanic, McKenzie, Broda, Shumway, Boyle, Peeples, Mignone, Burke.

Meeting began at 4:00 PM.

Minutes taken by Scott Peeples

Quinn Burke opened the meeting by explaining that the committee's workload is increasing as we are called on to review program changes, but he still intends to keep meetings to one hour every other week.

At our last meeting there was a question regarding how much or what kind of authority the committee has regarding iTEP and other recommendations; Burke clarified that the FCAS reports its recommendations to the Senate and the Senate votes.

Minutes from 9/14 were lightly edited and approved.

Major GPA Policy Revision: Last year this task was shared by FCAS, Academic Planning, and Curriculum. The Provost has indicated that FCAS should take the lead this year and make a recommendation to the Senate. Burke stated that we should probably present two or three options to the senate in November. The committee reviewed three current options.

Bob Mignone has reviewed the pros and cons of options 1 and 2 and suggests combining those options, since he sees little meaningful difference between them. With option 3, no department would be able to enforce a major GPA requirement, and many departments clearly want to continue to do so. So while option 3 has the virtue of simplicity, it would be adamantly opposed by a number of departments.

The committee discussed a few scenarios that complicate the application of the current options and the choice between counting only the courses that an individual student was required to take to complete a major versus counting every course that could have been applied to that student's major. The committee discussed the implications for GPA calculation in departments/majors with multidisciplinary tracks or concentrations and in interdisciplinary majors.

Mignone made the point that no solution is going to satisfy everyone.

Deborah Boyle asked, if the Registrar's Office has a way of categorizing the courses already, why don't we stick with that?
Burke suggested that Mignone add comments to the current document outlining the three options, which Burke will share with the committee. Burke asked that members of this committee to send additional comments to him via email.

**iTEP/One Earth:** Burke expressed confidence about One Earth as an external evaluator.

Regarding ITEP, Mignone said he would like to hear from faculty in LCWA before making a recommendation.

Ricard Viñas de Puig agreed to share the information on iTEP with two colleagues who have expertise in language assessment and report back to the committee.

*A motion to recommend approving One Earth as an external evaluator for international students was unanimously approved.*

**Grievance Panel:** Burke explained the need to form a 3-person panel to hear a student grievance and shared a memo from the Provost requesting the panel. Three committee members’ names were randomly drawn from a hat: Viñas de Puig, Burke, and Von Bakanic. Scott Peeples’ name was drawn as an alternate.

The committee did not discuss outstanding late withdrawal petitions; Burke encouraged committee members to vote and comment on the petitions currently posted on OAKS.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Peeples
FCAS Committee Meeting, 10/12/16

Minutes of Faculty Committee on Academic Standards Meeting
Wednesday, October 12, 2016
School of Education, Dean's Conference Room

Attending: Von Bakanic, Deborah Boyle, Quinn Burke (Chair), Bob Mignone, Scott Peeples, Ricard Viñas-de-Puig; Michelle Futrell (ex officio), Shannon McKenzie (ex officio)

The meeting began at 4:00 p.m.

The minutes of the FCAS meeting held on September 28, 2016 were approved.

Grievance Panels: Quinn Burke reported that at the request of the Provost, two panels have been convened to hear student academic grievances. Each panel consists of three members of the Academic Standards Committee. The members of the first panel were randomly chosen at the September 28 meeting. Burke announced the members of the second panel, whom he had previously randomly chosen from a list of those committee members who had said they would be able to serve: Burke, Viñas-de-Puig, and Shumway.

iTEP/One Earth: Burke reported that at the October 11 Faculty Senate meeting, the Senate unanimously approved adding OneEarth as an external evaluator.

Burke asked Viñas-de-Puig to report on what his LCWA colleagues with expertise in language assessment thought about adding the iTEP as an English proficiency exam for incoming international students. Viñas-de-Puig reported that one colleague was in favor of allowing it, one colleague had not yet responded, and that he personally was in favor of allowing it. Burke requested that after the second colleague responds, Viñas-de-Puig should prepare a 1-2 sentence statement that he could present to the Senate at the next meeting.

Student Petitions:

Late Withdrawal Petition:
Student TB: Denied 5-0, with 1 abstention

Two Proposed Changes/Clarifications for Programmatic Academic Standards:
Burke reported that Honors College Committee Chair Phyllis Jestice has sent a proposal from that committee to add two items to the definition of “good standing” for first-, second-, and third-year students in the Honors College: (1) No Class I or Class II Honor Code violations, and (2) No conduct violation that has resulted in the sanction of suspension or expulsion.

Burke said he thought the additions were designed to promote rigor and honesty in the Honors College, and that they seemed sensible to him. He pointed out that if FCAS approved the additions, then the Chair of the Honors College Committee would present them to the Senate for their vote.
Peeples asked what motivated the proposal; Burke said he did not know whether any specific incident in the Honors College had motivated it and that Jestice had not explained the motivation. Peeples wondered if the proposed changes were partly an attempt to make expectations clearer to the students.

Burke wondered if first-year students already enrolled in the College could be admitted to the Honors College in their sophomore year if they already had an Honor Code violation. A look at the Honors College web site did not settle the question, but the committee thought it unlikely.

Mignone said he could not think of a reason not to approve the proposal. Boyle wondered if adoption of the changes would require changes to the Honor Board’s list of possible sanctions for Honor Code violations, and Burke said the Honors College Committee would contact units at the College that would be affected by the change.

*A motion to recommend approving the new language for “good standing” in the Honors College was unanimously approved.*

Burke then explained the second proposed change: the Faculty Curriculum Committee is reviewing a proposal for an Internship in Biology (BIOL 381) that would be Pass/Fail and repeatable up to 6 credit hours. However, Burke pointed out, Pass/Fail courses are typically not allowed for the major (or minor).

The committee discussed how to interpret the language in the College policy that no Pass/Fail courses may be “taken in one’s major or minor fields.” (1) One interpretation is that no courses intended for a major (or minor), regardless of whether they are needed for an individual student’s major or minor, should be Pass/Fail. In other words, no applicable courses in the major (or minor) should be Pass/Fail. (2) Another interpretation is that none of the courses that a student takes to meet the requirements of a major (or minor) should be Pass/Fail, but that any courses a student takes in the major (or minor) beyond the required ones could be Pass/Fail.

Burke pointed out that this ambiguity of “courses taken in a major or minor” is related to the ambiguity regarding what courses should count in calculating a student’s major GPA. Mignone said that if the major GPA policy changes, having Pass/Fail options in the major would complicate things.

Futrell pointed out that the clinical practice (student teaching) requirements in EDEE are apparent exceptions to the policy, for those courses are required for the major but are Pass/Fail. The committee then discussed whether internships are analogous to those clinical practice courses. EDEE clinical practice courses are Pass/Fail, but they are 12-hour courses, whereas BIOL 381 would be up to 6 hours. Internships in Arts Management, English, and Communication are graded.
The committee discussed the implications if BIOL 381 were to be required for the major, concluding that, given the ambiguous language currently in the College Catalog, BIOL 381 could not be required for the major and be Pass/Fail. The committee also considered whether the Biology Department could request an exception, so that BIOL 381 could be both required for the major and Pass/Fail. Mignone suggested that a question to bring to the Senate in the future might be whether internships can be Pass/Fail.

Burke suggested that the committee should deny the BIOL 381 proposal now, because the current catalog wording (“taken in the major”) is too ambiguous to allow Biology students to take BIOL 381 as Pass/Fail. The committee decided to propose to the Faculty Senate that they clarify the language in the Pass/Fail policy.

**Major GPA:** Burke reported that the committee’s two options for the major GPA were presented to the Faculty Senate at the October 11 meeting and that there was some pushback regarding the language of Option #1. He asked the committee to vote on whether we preferred Option #2 (to have no major GPA), or preferred the intent of Option #1 (to keep the major GPA based on courses that are “applicable” to the major), with exact wording for Option #1 to be worked out in consultation with Senators. Mignone mentioned that he has been in email communication with Joe Kelly, Alex Kasman, Susan Kattwinkel, Larry Krasnoff, and others about wordsmithing Option #1. Burke said that he needed to communicate the committee’s decision to Todd McNerney by November 1.

Peeples asked whether the Registrar Mary Bergstrom could implement Option #1. Burke answered that yes, according to the Registrar, Option #1 could be implemented. Peeples then asked whether Option #2 was so unpopular that we shouldn’t even consider it. There was some discussion about how some departments don’t care about the major GPA, while others (math, business, sciences) do. For example, some faculty in Biology don’t want to count students’ grades in math or organic chemistry towards the major GPA. Mignone pointed out that as an alternative to a major GPA, the College could require that students get a C in every course in the major, but he thought the Senate might be reluctant to do that.

Futrell asked whether individual departments could require a major GP even if the Senate voted to eliminate it. Mignone replied that they could not; since someone in the department would have to calculate the major GPA, it wouldn’t be considered by the Registrar; and it could not be a degree requirement for some departments but not others.

*A motion to recommend keeping the major GPAs, and to offer the Senate alternative language for Option #1, was unanimously approved.*

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01.

*Respectfully submitted by Deborah Boyle*
Call to Order
The meeting was begun at 4:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes from the FCAS meeting convened on Oct. 2, 2016 were approved.

Business
1. Undergraduate Academic Forgiveness Policy
Burke invited Michael Faikes to speak about his proposal for an academic forgiveness policy. Michael had already visited FCAS to speak about the proposal in Spring 2016. Faikes described the current course repeat policy at the College of Charleston, which allows for repetition of up to 12 cr. hr. of classes, but without replacing the prior grade in the course. Faikes then described his new policy, which permits students to exclude up to 7 cr. hr. of grades of D+ or below from the calculation of their cumulative GPA. Faikes described the policy as suitable for students changing majors after a re-evaluation of their interests. Clemson University and USC already have academic forgiveness policies implemented. There are “controls” in the proposal to close loopholes and prevent “grade shopping,” such as requiring students to use the grade exclusion option within their first 45 cr. hr. of classes and preventing STEP readmission students from using the policy. Faikes intends to present the proposal to the Faculty Senate, following approval by SGA Senate via a resolution at one of the first SGA Senate sessions in order to demonstrate student support.

Faikes also mentioned that the Registrar was personally consulted about the potential new policy, though understandably the Registrar was not excited about the logistics of the possible change. However, Faikes noted that Clemson
University, which has already implemented a similar policy, uses the same management software system (Banner) as the College of Charleston, suggesting that implementation is feasible.

Boyle asked why the 45-hour stipulation was decided in particular; Faikes responded that the number was actually suggested by FCAS in the Spring and that the stipulation was intended to prevent senior students from “grade picking” just before graduation.

Burke and McKenzie voiced questions on whether this policy would unduly exclude transfer students who arrive with many earned hours, as well as incoming students with AP credits. Faikes said he would consider options that would accommodate transfer students.

Some FCAS members were concerned about scholarship eligibility under the policy. Faikes responded that he conversed with the Clemson University registrar about scholarships, who noted that the state allows course exclusion. Moreover, Clemson University has some of the highest scholarship retention in the state.

Many FCAS members requested a list of institutions that offer grade forgiveness in order to compare their policies. In particular, Mignone wanted to view policies and data for Coastal Carolina University, Francis Marion University, and other 4-year institutions in the state. Furthermore, Peeples voiced concerns over trends in grade inflation, which he feared a forgiveness policy could exacerbate. Broda responded that he had some data from Clemson University that could help determine if academic forgiveness polices there (post 2013) contributed to grade inflation. Dr. Burke then requested that Faikes and Broda obtain the requested information over the break and deliver the information to the committee by Jan. 13 in order that FCAS may consider the proposal in light of the new information at the first meeting of the Spring.

2. Pass-Fail restrictions (Dec. Senate Proposal)
With regards to the pass-fail option at the College of Charleston, Mignone commented that he had re-read the policy, and came to the recognition that there were never any restrictions on a department for offering pass-fail courses, so long as the pass-fail course was not a major requirement. According to Mignone’s reckoning, restrictions are only for students requesting a change of an ordinarily graded course to a pass-fail course.
3. Review of Major GPA Policy (Yet Again)

Provost McGee had referred the discussion on options for a uniform College of Charleston Major GPA policy to FCAS once again. On Oct. 12, 2016, FCAS had unanimously voted for Option 1 for the major GPA policy, which stipulates that the major GPA is calculated from a subset of courses in a student’s major that includes only courses required for the student’s particular track in a major. A minimum major GPA of 2.00 would be required for graduation irrespective of the major.

The other major GPA options included Option 2 and Option 3. Option 2 would eliminate the major GPA altogether. Academic standards could be maintained by requiring passing prerequisite courses in a major with a given minimum grade.

Option 3 was introduced by the Provost and Registrar at the Dec. Faculty Senate session. As FCAS had not considered this option previously, it required FCAS to re-review the major GPA recommendation. Option 3 would allow departments to independently stipulate what courses would be incorporated into the calculation of the major GPA and which courses would be excluded via a list provided to the Registrar. A student would have to attain a major GPA of at least 2.00 in one major in order to graduate. This option is appealing to the Biology Department among others, which would prefer to exclude certain required courses such as organic chemistry from the calculation of major GPA. Indeed, Seth Pritchard (Biology Department Chair) explicitly wrote to FCAS to declare his support of Option 3 and opposition to Options 1 and 2.

Mignone felt that Option 3 did not maintain consistency or uniformity, which McGee requested for the new major GPA policy. Nonetheless, it could prove beneficial by providing departments with valuable flexibility in determination of their particular major GPA.

Burke subsequently paraphrased McGee as very recently stating that consistency may have to be sacrificed in favor of transparency. Burke maintained his support of Option 1, which he felt preserved consistency.

Mignone then described how he had come “full-circle” in his evaluation of the major GPA options; he declared his support of Option 2 and rejected Option 1 as the least palatable option.
After discussion, FCAS voted unanimously for Option 3 as the preferred option, followed by Option 2 as the alternative option (Viñas-de-Puig dissented on the alternative option and instead voted for Option 1 as the alternative option).

4. Determination of New Committee Time

FCAS then discussed the new meeting time for FCAS. It was determined that maintaining alternating Wednesdays at 4:00 p.m. in the School of Education would be the most accommodating option. However, in order to ensure no conflicts with members’ other Wednesday meeting times, the first meeting of the Spring semester would have to be Jan. 11, instead of Jan. 13 as tentatively proposed earlier.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.
FCAS Committee Meeting, 1/11/17

Minutes of Faculty Committee on Academic Standards Meeting
Wednesday, January 11, 2017
School of Education, Room 217

Attending: Von Bakanic, Deborah Boyle, Ted Broda (student representative), Quinn Burke (Chair), Bob Mignone, Scott Peeples, Ricard Viñas-de-Puig; Shannon McKenzie (ex officio)

The meeting began at 4:00 p.m.

Quinn Burke reported that Provost Brian McGee and Dean Godfrey Gibbison (School of Professional Studies) would be at the Committee’s January 25 meeting to discuss a proposed new program for paralegals.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the FCAS meeting held on December 7, 2016 were approved.

Student Petitions:
Late Withdrawal Petitions:
Student SC: Approved unanimously
Student AB: Approved prior to the meeting by super-majority on OAKS
Student HN: Approved prior to the meeting by super-majority on OAKS
Student DB: Approved prior to the meeting by super-majority on OAKS
Student LM: Approved prior to the meeting by super-majority on OAKS
Student KB: Approved unanimously
Student KJ: Approved by 5 committee members prior to the meeting; Burke said he would read it and vote on OAKS after the meeting
Student CP: Burke requested that committee members vote on OAKS after the meeting
Student BR: Request for further documentation (specifically, documentation of eligibility for SNAP services)

Senior Coursework Elsewhere Petition:
Student DA: Approved unanimously.

During the discussion of whether to approve Student DA’s request to allow more than 7 hours of coursework done elsewhere to count towards the degree, the Committee decided that we should document how to handle possible exceptions for a readmitted student who, after having completed enough credit hours to be classified as a senior, changes his/her major, still has to complete more than one or two semesters’ worth of credit hours to complete that major, and who
wishes to take more than 7 credit hours of coursework elsewhere. The committee thought such exceptions could be modeled on a similar exception sometimes granted to students who return to the College to pursue a second degree.

Student JS: Approved prior to the meeting by super-majority on OAKS

*Petition for Late Grade Change sent from Chemistry Department*

Student FD: Approved unanimously

**Undergraduate Academic Forgiveness Policy:**
Burke said that more information about the Student Government Association's proposal for an Academic Forgiveness policy would be on the agenda at the next meeting (January 25). Broda briefly listed the main features of the policy and answered some of the committee members' questions, such as whether students on academic probation could take advantage of the policy (answer: they couldn’t) and how this policy would affect LIFE Scholarships (answer: it seems that those scholarships are compatible with this policy).

**Change in Meeting Day/Time**
Burke asked if it would be possible for members to attend meetings at a time other than Wednesdays at 4:00, since one member of the Committee has other commitments at that time. Members of the Committee discussed possible options and decided to see if meeting on Mondays at 4:00 would work for everyone.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03.

Respectfully submitted by Deborah Boyle
SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS
Faculty Committee on Academic Standards (FCAS)
Meeting on Jan. 25, 2017
Conference Room, School of Education

Call to Order
The meeting was begun at 4:00 p.m. Present for the meeting were FCAS members Eunice Bakanic, Deborah Boyle, William Burke (chair), Theodore Carrigan-Broda (student representative), Michelle Futrell (ex officio member; arrived later), Shannon McKenzie (ex officio member), Robert Mignone, Laurence Peeples, and Ricard Viñas-de-Puig, in addition to guests Michael Faikes (President, SGA), Godfrey Gibbison (Dean, Professional Studies), and Brian McGee (Provost). Notes for the meeting were taken by Broda.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes from the prior FCAS meeting (taken by Boyle) were not approved due to time constraints. The minutes will be reviewed for approval at the next meeting of FCAS.

Business
1. Applied Legal Studies Program Proposal
Dr. Gibbison addressed the committee on the possibility of a paralegal studies bachelors program at the College of Charleston for paralegal studies associates. Trident Technical College offers a SACS-accredited and ABA (American Bar Association)-approved associate’s degree in paralegal studies; however, many employers expect a bachelor’s degree so as to attest writing skills. Thus, many Trident associates are seeking a bachelor’s degree in legal studies. Loyola University, among other institutions, offer such a program.

Provost McGee then described the station of associate’s degrees in South Carolina. Applied sciences degrees, requiring 60–70 cr. hr. of coursework to complete, are becoming prevalent. Some degrees incorporate general-education coursework of collegiate standards, whereas other degrees incorporate technical courses unsuitable for transfer to a 4-year institution (welding, etc.)

McGee continued that Trident is developing coursework that 4-year institutions find acceptable for transfer (such as English courses). Transfer of credits is arbitrated by the appropriate dean at the College of Charleston, but some
disciplines are not represented by a school at the College. Help is needed to evaluate the rigor and relevancy of Trident law courses.

Deans have an unchecked discretion over the transference of courses; however, consistency among College deans is lacking. Some deans accepted requested transfer courses without a corresponding course in the College catalogue (such as special topics) as transferred electives, whereas other deans would not accept transfer credits. The state of Florida mandates the portability of general-education courses from any state institution, including technical schools, thus avoiding inconsistency.

However, MgGee added that not all technical schools offer the same quality or scope of courses. If the transfer of associate’s degrees are to be accepted, then a consistent core of general education classes must be required. Most students of 2-year degrees are interested in technical training for the labor force; portability is an afterthought. Thus ensuring transferability will be difficult.

Mignone asked whether a third party could evaluate transfer courses on behalf of the College. McGee responded that the School of Business (which encompasses legal studies at the College) does not wish to develop the program right now, so an external expert will likely be contracted.

Mignone also asked if students will use the College of Charleston bachelor’s degree as a “stepping stone” to law school. Gibbison replied that it is entirely possible. Many application offices appreciate an applied paralegal degree, as other majors do not prepare for law school.

Gibbison and McGee explained that associate’s degrees in South Carolina are “bottlenecking” students who wish to pursue higher studies, as their coursework often does not transfer. Hence, considering more accommodating transfer policies is necessary to ameliorate this statewide higher education issue.

McKenzie expressed her concern with expanding transfer credit acceptance. McKenzie explained that she recently met with 200 students on academic probation, most of whom were transfer students. McKenzie believed that the transfer students were unprepared for the rigor of a College of Charleston education.

McGee responded by acknowledging that transfer students often have difficulty adjusting. Nonetheless, Trident students often perform better than other
transfers. Support is still lacking for many of these students, who are frequently older than conventional students.

Gibbison also affirmed that “scaffolding,” including some remediation, will need to be incorporated into the Bachelors of Professional Studies program.

Godfrey then mentioned that Columbia, SC is one of the top ten metropolitan areas for paralegals, so demand for a bachelors in paralegal studies is high. McGee will work on policy at the state level.

Expansion into allied health programs are also a possibility.

2. Review of SGA Academic Forgiveness Proposal
SGA President Faikes reiterated his proposal to exclude up to 7 cr. hr. of institutional coursework from cumulative GPA calculation.

Mignone asked if the proposal intended to allow partial exclusion of courses (e.g., exclude 2 out of 3 cr. hr. of a course), or whether courses must be excluded in toto (course units). Faikes clarified that the proposal intended in toto exclusion, and that the wording would be clarified to reflect this.

McKenzie explained that Academic Probation status was a function of cumulative GPA; thus, students on Academic Probation would be able to evade the clause of the proposal that stated that the status of students in poor academic standing would not change after a grade exclusion. Faikes and Broda accepted the recommendation of McKenzie that students on Academic Probation be precluded from requesting a grade exclusion until their status was resolved.

Some members of the committee were confused by the 45-hour rule. Faikes elucidated that a grade exclusion request could be made at any time prior to graduation (not merely before the student had surpasses 45 hours of institutional coursework), but the exclusion request could only be applied to courses completed within the first 45 hours.

Additionally, some members of the committee expressed concern that students may be able to exclude upper-level or required courses. Broda explained that excluded courses did not carry any earned hours, and that excluded required courses must still be repeated until a satisfactory grade is earned in order to complete major requirements. Furthermore, Faikes mentioned that the 45-hour rule would make it unlikely that a course exclusion could be applied to an
upper-level course. After some discussion, it was concluded that maintaining a list of courses excepted from the course exclusion privilege would make the policy proposal too convoluted and more difficult to implement with Banner.

The committee voted 5–1 to recommend the proposal to the Faculty Senate (Peeples dissented).

→ Chair Burke addendum 2/8/17:
  A FCAS committee member contacted the chair the evening of 1/25 to express concern that he was under the impression that Forgiveness policies at other institutions (e.g., those of Winthrop & USC) are ones of “repetition” (you must take the course again) versus “exclusion” (the CofC SGA Proposal). Accordingly, he asked we continue the discussion at the 2/8/17 meeting; Chair Burke emailed FCAS members the evening of 2/25/17 requesting the 5-1 vote be nullified and discussion continue on 2/8; no members dissented

3. Discussion of FCAS Guidelines
Burke suggested that the guidelines for the committee reflect that ex post facto diagnoses of a learning disability only be considered as grounds for late withdrawal if made within one semester of the courses in question.

Mignone suggested that Express classes be considered as separate from full-semester classes when designating a request as a selective withdrawal.
FCAS Committee Meeting, 2/8/17

Meeting began at 4:00. Present: Burke, Mignone, Boyle, Bakanic, Peeples, Viñas de Puig, McKenzie, Futrell, Cherry (Guest)
Note-taker: Peeples

Minutes from 1/11/17 and 1/25/17 were approved with minor edits.

Minutes from 1/11/17 and 1/25/17 were approved with minor edits.

Discussion of Academic Forgiveness Policy:
Burke reviewed some details of the proposal, emphasizing the difference between repetition (a policy by which, if a student takes the same course a second time, only the higher grade is calculated into GPA) and exclusion (by which a student can opt to exclude one or more grades from the GPA without retaking the courses). The SGA-approved proposal is an exclusion policy. Burke suggested putting the SGA’s proposal before the senate at the next meeting without a motion, to make senators aware of the proposal without putting it to an immediate vote. He added that Registrar Mary Bergstrom has said that if approved, the new policy would take at least 12 months to implement, and that Financial Aid and Athletics had received copies of the proposal only within the past few days.

Associate Provost Lynn Cherry asserted that Academic Affairs supports the forgiveness concept in principle, but she and her colleagues in AA believe that the proposal needs some revision. She reiterated that it could not be implemented until Fall 2018 at the earliest.

Mignone argued that if the proposal is going to be voted on by the Senate, then the FCAS should express an opinion on it.

Boyle asked if senators would be able to comment and ask questions about the proposal if it’s on the agenda as an FYI; Burke answered yes.

Mignone pointed out that the students could have any senator introduce the motion if the FCAS does not endorse it.

Peeples stated that it matters whether the proposal is presented to the Senate as a FCAS-sponsored proposal as opposed to a proposal that the FCAS is just a delivering on behalf of the SGA.

Mignone said that he had researched other schools’ policies, and that this type of forgiveness policy (exclusion) is not common. He would support a policy in which a student can retake a course and keep the higher grade only. He no longer supports the current version.
Boyle said that she felt misled by the students’ presentation of the policy as a common practice at other institutions.

Burke said that he took some responsibility for any misunderstanding in regard to the students’ presentation and that he believes the students tried to be clear about what they are proposing. He said that while most schools’ policies are repetition policies, the SGA representatives are advocating an exclusion policy. He also clarified that the previous FCAS vote is no longer on the record – he withdrew it because of misgivings from the committee.

Mignone said that in addition to bringing the proposal to the senate, it would be helpful if the FCAS were to weigh in.

Burke then said that he supports the proposal because he believes it has merit and he wants the senate to consider it.

Boyle said that she is ok with the proposal but would like the cover letter to reflect that this kind of forgiveness (exclusion) policy is not as common as the students currently claim; they should acknowledge the difference between exclusion and repetition policies when referring to what other institutions do.

Viñas de Puig stated that he still supports the proposal. Noting that one institution cited in the proposal – UT Arlington – has both repetition and exclusion policies, he asked if CofC would also have both types of forgiveness.

Following up, Bakanic asked if a student could exclude the same course twice. Cherry indicated that the Registrar has scheduled a meeting with SGA representatives to work out technical and logistical issues.

There was further discussion about whether courses repeated for a higher grade would have to be taken at CofC in order for the second (presumably higher) grade to count, and further discussion about the implications for STEP readmission. With the understanding that the proposal would stipulate that “replacement” courses would have to be taken at CofC, the proposal was put to a vote: 3 in favor (Boyle, Viñas de Puig, Burke), 3 opposed (Mignone, Peeples, Bakanic).

**Late Withdrawal Petitions**

Student AZ: The committee requests more documentation regarding the date of the ADHD diagnosis.

Student KP: approved 6-0.
Student JS: denied 6-0.
Student ZS: approved 4-2.
Student MD: approved 6-0.
Student BR: denied 6-0.
Student HM: approved 6-0.

**Senior Coursework Elsewhere Petitions**
Student CE: The committee will approve the 12 hours from Charleston Southern if
the student uses the 7 allowable hours (that do not require FCAS approval) toward
the 12 (that is, the committee is willing to approve an additional 5 hours). The
committee denied the request to grant 12 hours over and above the 7 she is allowed.
The vote was 6-0.

Student DS: Committee requests more information.
Student MS: Committee requests documentation on medical condition.
Student WO: Committee requests documentation.

**Adjourned at 5:45.**

Respectfully submitted by Scott Peeples.
FCAS Committee Meeting, 2/22/17

4:00 pm School of Education, Dean’s Conference Room
In attendance: Bakanic, Boyle, Burke (Chair), Chaffin, Mignone, Peeples, Viñas-de-Puig; Broda (student representative); Futrell (ex-officio), McKenzie (ex-officio).
Minutes taken by Viñas-de-Puig

Meeting started at 4.05pm.
Committee convened in Dean’s Conference Room, School of Education; Viñas-de-Puig was nominated to be secretary.

1. Minutes of previous FCAS meeting
Viñas-de-Puig noted an error on his last name on the previous meeting minutes. The minutes of the FCAS meeting held on February 8, 2016 were approved unanimously with the above-mentioned correction.

2. Vote on pending requests

2a. Late Withdrawal Petitions
Before initiating the vote on pending requests, Burke indicated that, in general, FCAS does not review petitions over two years old. However, in exceptional cases, some petitions can be reviewed.

• Student OC: Approved by online supermajority vote.
• Student KS: Approved by unanimous decision.
• Student VG: Denied by online supermajority vote.
• Student JZ: Denied by a 5-2 vote.
• Student AZ: After some discussion on the diagnosis and the new evidence on the student’s ADHD condition, the petition was approved by unanimous decision.

At this point, Mignone inquired how many times a student can request a late withdrawal. Bakanic and McKenzie both indicated that a student can request three times, and Bakanic added that a warning letter is sent to the student after the third time submits a request.

Mignone asked if a student can reapply for withdrawal for previous semesters after being diagnosed with ADHD. McKenzie replied by stating that a student is only allowed one reason for application, and added that diagnosis does not mean that there is a disability.

2b. Course Elsewhere Petitions

• Student DS: Approved by unanimous decision.
• Student MS: Approved by unanimous decision.

3. Grade redemption policy
Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources Dr. Lynn Cherry joined the meeting at this point.
Burke indicated that some changes were made to the previously discussed policy after having received suggestions from the Office of the Registrar. Based on these suggestions, the new policy allows for a grade redemption, instead of grade exclusion.

Broda added that this revised policy presented fewer concerns than the previously discussed grade exclusion policy.

Burke stated the College of Charleston is an outlier among the institutions in the Colonial League, as most of the other institutions in the Colonial League have grade redemption policies. Burke also added that the new policy proposal had not been presented to the Senate.

Associate Provost Cherry indicated that she was present at the meeting to answer any question that the members of FCAS might have. She also said that she would support such a policy if the faculty agree.

Mignone affirmed that the new version of the policy was cleaner and that he prefers a grade redemption policy over a grade exclusion policy, as it presents a more accurate description of what can be done.

Broda claimed that this new policy proposal is less lenient, as students have to demonstrate that the course needs redemption. He also indicated that this policy requires a higher degree of accountability from the part of the student.

After some discussion on the difference between course redemption and course repetition, Mignone stated that redemption invalidates repetition. Burke requested that an additional sentence be added to the policy proposal making it clear that a course can only be retaken once under the grade redemption policy.

At this point, Associate Provost Cherry explained that students can only repeat a passed course once. For required courses, in those instances in which they don’t have a minimum grade after repeat, students have two options: i. to provide evidence to the corresponding department, who will make a decision on a case by case basis; or ii. to change majors.

Mignone indicated that if a student takes a redemption course and gets an F grade, the student can then retake the course again. McKenzie added that the language in the course redemption policy should indicate that a student keeps the second grade. Broda asked whether, in such a case, the language of ‘earned hours’ could be used. Associate Provost Cherry indicated that that was not a possibility. Futrell also inquired how this policy affects academic standing, and McKenzie also wondered how an application of this policy would affect the semester in which the policy applies, and whether it would affect academic probation for the initial semester. Associate Provost Cherry responded that in case a student makes a decision regarding continuation, the new grade would be considered, with a subsequent recalculation of the GPA from previous terms. She also stated that, in
most cases, one single course does not significantly affect the depth of probation. Futrell replied that, in that case, it would affect academic probation. Associate Provost Cherry indicated that it would be necessary then to know which students are in probation and redemption.

At this point, Burke intervened to indicate that the policy would not take effect until the fall semester of 2018.

Peeples also inquired whether it would be possible to know when a given student is taking a course through the redemption policy or if that student is repeating the course. Burke stated that students must complete a form and inform the Office of the Registrar before the date of course withdrawal. Mignone added that a student can start a taking a course as repeat and later decide if they take it under the repeat policy or the course redemption policy.

Mignone also questioned whether the transcript indicates whether a student is in academic probation. If this information is not included in the transcript, he does not see a problem, as the course will be removed from GPA calculations. Futrell responded that in those cases it impacts the decision-making process on the academic probation status of the student.

Burke added that Athletics does not have a problem with the proposed policy and that Financial Aid had not yet responded.

Associate Provost Cherry made it clear again that a student can retake a course multiple times, but can repeat a course only once.

After the discussion, and with the understanding that a sentence be added to the proposal indicating that a course can only be retaken once under course redemption policy, the members of FCAS voted unanimously in favor of such a proposal.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:25pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ricard Viñas-de-Puig
Meeting commenced at 4:07 p.m.

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes from February 22, 2017

   It was noted that there was a spelling error in Von Bakanic’s name. The minutes from the February 22, 2017 meeting were unanimously approved.

2. Grade redemption policy

   Burke indicated at the Tuesday March 15th Senate meeting the issue came up of possibly limiting the number of redeemed credits to 8. There was a concern that without a cap, a culture would be established that as long as you paying tuition (and are privileged to do so) you can redeem as many credits as you like. The other issue was whether the redemption policy should only apply to certain grades (e.g. D or below vs. a student has a B but wants an A)

   Bob – Instead of waiting for withdrawal date to put in petition, it was suggested that the drop/add date may be more reasonable - don't want to clog up the system. Also we don't want students hanging around who are wealthy enough to keep repeating courses - can clog up the system some as well. How are other institutions doing it?

   Quinn indicated that Ted did some research - e.g. University of South Carolina (the redemption policy applies to 1.0 (D) or below). With some schools students can redeem as many credits as they want to

   Deborah – Unlimited redemption privileges wealthy students who are seeking to gain the GPA they want

   Bob - Space on campus is an issue

   Lynn - When meeting with Financial Aid they indicated that the redemption cannot be inconsistent with repeat policy (which is 12 hours max); it could be fewer

   Scott – We are considering 12 versus 8

   LaTasha - How are scholarships impacted?

   Von – How are Life scholarships impacted?

   Lynn – Don in Financial Aid is happy that there is a form that students have to
complete & perhaps a financial aid signature would be good. Clemson did not have a form & students could redeem & Clemson’s Registrar did not know what courses students were redeeming without such a form.

When schools are audited, financial aid is audited and random financial aid recipients are selected. If the GPA calculation is different because students have redeemed replaced a grade), the government does not recognize this.

The federal government (e.g. loans) does not recognize redemption. Once a course is taken, loans paid for the 1st time won't be approved to paid for a 2nd time. This is the same for Veterans benefits, (not a redemption issue - yet they will only pay for it once), once credit is earned.

Redemption is when students passed the course & wanted a better grade

Students are at risk to not get a loan approved if they previously passed it & take it a 2nd time

Shannon –Example - 9 hours vs. 12 (& 9 already awarded) it will generate a bill for the student. The college or the student has to repay the money; if the student does not pay the bill (registration hold); under SC law - after a certain amount of time, through collections the state will garnish wages

Lynn - Redeemed course goes into attempted hours (not earned hours but quality hours). The 2nd grade replaces the first grade. If this is what the policy said this is fine. The hours would have been earned the 1st time; 2nd time they don't "earn" hours - which is why financial aid won't pay

If a student fails they have not earned the hours and financial aid will pay. A student can retake it as many times as they want as long as there is satisfactory academic progress with a student passing, not withdrawing from 67% of courses (falling below that - they can appeal for continued financial aid)

SC State Life Scholarship – Continuation is based on 2 criteria (# of credit hours earned in an academic year (including summer school) & the GPA

In applying the redemption policy – if a student earned credit 1st semester; 2nd semester redeem grade (don't earn credit); unless the student earned 30 hours in fall & spring (and GPA is acceptable), the student would only earn 29 hours because they took one course for redemption. The student would have to pay for a summer class which is expensive & financial aid does not extend to summer.

Von – If the scholarship extends to the summer, it counts as a semester & students waste a semester on one course in the summer

Lynn- A student can take a class at Trident Tech (a SC accredited school. If they don't then they have lost their Life scholarship (e.g. took 15 hours each semester - only earned 27 hours)
Quinn - Should we table this until Lynn speaks further with financial aid? It sounds like it would be good for financial aid to sign off on the form as well.
Lynn – With the repeat policy, the grade does not change. Redemption changes the grade. The 1st grade is removed, the GPA changes and there are multiple semester GPA changes.
Quinn - This needs to get to the Senate next week (by the 30th) in order for the change to happen this year.

Bob - Will the board come up with a policy if we don't?

Lynn – From her understanding, they don't have the authority yet they could make strong recommendations.

Deborah – This policy is student driven.

Bob – With the logic of rewriting history - the redemption should be going forward from the point the class is redeemed.

Quinn – There is a peer institution comparison report on academic—e.g. Appalachian State University allows redemption for an - A- or below; Others it is a C

LaTasha - What happens if students get a lower grade?

Lynn and Michelle – The student keeps the lower grade.

Scott – I am comfortable with the 12 hours & no specification on the grade that can be replaced.

Ricard, Deborah and LaTasha indicated they were comfortable with what Scott posed as well.

Von stated that she is comfortable with what was posed, with a financial aid signature.

It was discussed that Fall 2018 - is when the policy would be implemented.

Michelle - Should we address the when in the semester?

Quinn – We can follow up with Registrars (drop/add date vs. withdrawal date).

Deborah – A grade redemption course - 2nd sentence - grade redemption course may only be "retaken once for a grade"

Quinn - Should this be "redeemed"? Submit the form by the withdrawal date - prefer to get it before add/drop.
Scott - This language needs to be clear to distinguish from courses that have been failed

Bob - Language "A grade redemption course may only be redeemed once for a grade" or "A" graded course will only be taken once for redemption" (Courses has to be redeemed at the College)

3. Vote on Pending Requests

Late Withdrawal Petitions

Student OB: Approved (Unanimous)
Student SP: Approved (Unanimous)
Student LA: Approved (Unanimous). Some discussion ensued regarding student that petitioned for late withdrawal after the 2 year deadline. There was a discussion that although there was no medical documentation of depression (yet evidence of taking medication) there was a family culture of not discussing depression and the students’ academic department indicated that there was not effective advising during the time period that the student struggled.

Student ZVS: Approved (Unanimous) There was some discussion that although the student did not have documentation of friend's suicide during the semester prior to him requesting withdrawal he had sufficient medical documentation of continuing depression

Meeting adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

Next meeting Wednesday April 5th at 4 p.m., School of Education, Dean’s Conference Room
The meeting began at 4:04 p.m.
The minutes of the FCAS meeting held on March 22, 2017 were approved with minor changes.

**Grade Redemption Policy:**

Burke distributed a handout with Version #7 of the grade redemption policy. He reported that the grade redemption policy proposal would not go to the Faculty Senate until Fall 2017, because the deadline for the Senate to consider the policy this semester had already passed (on March 30). He observed that this year’s committee can continue to discuss the issue, but that it would be good to get feedback from Mary Bergstrom, Financial Aid, and Athletics before sending it on to the Senate. In particular, Athletics has concerned about current language in the proposal that would require students using the grade redemption policy to take the grade received when the course is retaken.

Burke also pointed out that while the committee had proposed that students be allowed to take up to 12 credit hours under the course redemption policy (in order to be consistent with the current course-repeat policy), the Registrar had suggested that the policy allow 4 courses. Associate Provost Cherry added some background information about this change; she said that at the committee’s meeting two weeks ago, she had passed along a recommendation from Mary Bergstrom that the policy allow up to 12 credit hours, a recommendation that Bergstrom had made based on conversations about grade redemption policies with colleagues at a conference two weeks before that. However, Cherry said, the recommendation was now to allow up to 4 courses instead of up to 12 credit hours because this would make the policy more flexible, since some courses are 4-credit hours (ENGL 110 and some foreign language courses, for example). Cherry acknowledged that phrasing the grade redemption policy in terms of courses would be inconsistent with the course-repeat policy (which is currently phrased in terms of credit hours), and said she thought that the latter policy would probably need to be reviewed at some point, too.

The committee members discussed the advantages and disadvantages of using courses rather than credit hours in the grade redemption policy. It was noted that while allowing up to 4 courses would make it possible for someone to redeem up to 16 credit hours, it seems unlikely that this would occur, since most courses are only 3 credit hours. It was also noted that redeeming a 2-credit-hour course would use up one of the student’s allowed 4 courses. If students retook a science course and an associated lab, that would use up two of the allowed 4 courses. Cherry noted
that students could redeem just one part of a science course; for example, they could redeem the lecture portion but not the lab. Burke noted that there would be considerable differences in the way different students used the policy. He also thought that a more restrictive policy was preferable.

Viñas-de-Puig observed that an earlier version of the grade redemption policy would have allowed students to redeem up to 7 credit hours, so this change to 4 courses would more than double the allowable number of credit hours that students could redeem. Cherry said that this issue had come up at the Senate, and that some senators had wondered why the policy should be limited at all; at that point, it was decided to limit the policy by making it align with the course-repeat policy that allows up to 12 credit hours to be repeated. Viñas-de-Puig noted that Version #7 of the policy no longer matches the course-repeat policy. Burke reiterated that the Senate had resisted capping the policy at all.

Burke reminded the committee members that there were other aspects of the policy to discuss, such as the maximum grade requirement of C- for redeeming a course and the two-semester limit for applying to redeem a course. Bakanic asked what would happen if a course isn’t offered again within two semesters; in that case, several committee members noted, the student could not redeem that course.

Bakanic asked if the limit to 4 courses applied to the lifetime of a student. Cherry said that this was an undergraduate policy only; it does not apply to students pursuing master’s degrees.

The committee discussed possible changes to the language of Version #7. Burke suggested moving the sixth sentence (“Transfer credit or coursework completed elsewhere is not eligible for grade redemption under this policy”) to after the third sentence (“Grade redemption only applies to courses completed in residence at the College of Charleston”). Chaffin asked whether the second sentence of the third paragraph should say “redeeming” rather than “repeating,” and pointed out that the opening sentence of the fourth paragraph referred to a course being “repeated for grade redemption,” where that should say “a course retaken for grade redemption.” Bakanic said that the first paragraph refers to “W” as a “status indicator,” and wondered how the policy would apply to courses where a student received a WA. Cherry said that a course with a grade of WA could be retaken for redemption. Peeples noted that the third paragraph of the policy requires that students “gain a signature on the Grade Redemption Form,” and wondered why this was so vague and whether the policy should specify whose signature was needed. Futrell said that which signature was needed would vary depending on the student’s situation. Peeples suggested that the policy say students must “gain appropriate signatures.” Chaffin asked if the policy should specify that students need signatures from Financial Aid, Athletics, or Undergraduate Academic Services, but Cherry said that the form would indicate what signatures students needed.

Burke turned to the requirement expressed in the opening sentence of Version #7, that grade redemption be allowed only for courses where a grade of C- or lower was earned. He said that staff who work with Financial Aid, Scholarships, and Athletics want such a limitation, although consistency with the course-repeat policy would entail that any course should be able to be redeemed. Cherry noted that the reason for a C- limit is that students need to show “satisfactory academic progress.” If a student redeemed a course with a grade of C- or lower, that would
boost the student’s GPA (thereby contributing to academic progress), while redeeming a course where a grade of (for example) B+ had been earned would not significantly advance the student’s progress towards graduation. Also, allowing redemptions of any grade would privilege more affluent students, or could cause students to take on more debt when, strictly speaking, they do not need to do so in order to make “academic progress.”

On the issue of redeeming a course within two semesters, Burke pointed out that there are potential problems for students on Life Scholarships. Mignone asked whether redeemed grades would be eligible for Life Scholarships; Cherry said that financial aid cannot be used to pay for redeemed courses, but that there are two reasons the Financial Aid Office would like the two-semester requirement. First, since Financial Aid would have to manually recalculate a student’s GPA retroactively after a grade has been redeemed, this would be easier to do if fewer semesters have elapsed. Second, retaking a course within two semesters for grade redemption would make it more likely that a student could regain a lost Life Scholarship for the following year. Cherry also pointed out that the exclusion of summer from the two-semester requirement was made so that no student would have to take a course over the summer in order to use the grade redemption option. Chaffin asked whether a student who received a D in a fall course that was not offered until the following fall could take it then for redemption; the answer was yes. Mignone commented that some courses are not offered that often and suggested changing the policy to allow two years in which to redeem a course. Futrell reiterated that that would make implementing the policy difficult for Undergraduate Academic Services and the Registrar’s Office, since GPA recalculations would have to be done by hand. Mignone asked whether repeating a course changes a student’s GPA retroactively; the answer was that it does not, because repeating a course is like taking a new course. Mignone wondered why a computer cannot be programmed to do the GPA recalculations. Futrell and Cherry pointed out that the problem is with Banner; Mignone expressed frustration that college policies in many cases are driven by what Banner can and cannot do. McKenzie said that in this case, the policy was being made based on a very small group of students, if the percent of students on Life Scholarships is small. Cherry said that the Life Scholarship is just one type of financial aid, but that the vast majority of students receive some form of financial aid, such as loans, grants, or other scholarships. All these forms of financial aid have some sort of minimum earned credit requirements; many also have GPA minimum requirements.

Burke commented that the SGA’s original proposal for grade redemption had been targeted at students in an earlier stage of their college career (within the first 45 credit hours), but that the committee could decide whether to recommend this limitation. Mignone said that the reason for his objection to the requirement for redeeming courses after no more than two semesters was that some courses aren’t offered more often than every two years. Usually these are 400-level courses; Mignone wondered what kinds of courses students would be most likely to redeem. He also wondered what would happen if a student left the College and then came back; Futrell answered that the answer from the Registrar seemed to be that the two-semester rule would apply. Viñas-de-Puig asked if petitions to exceed two semesters would come to this committee. Burke asked what would happen if a
student tanked a whole semester, dropped out, and came back after four semesters. Cherry thought the answer would be that the student could not use the grade-redemption option because more than two semesters would have passed, but that such a student could petition for late withdrawal if they had tanked the whole semester. She thought the limit would need to be two semesters because students need to make progress towards graduation and noted that Financial Aid had discussed students redeeming three or four courses at once. Burke observed that Version #7 has no language about how many courses could be redeemed at once. He also asked whether the committee should add a sentence about not redeeming a course while on academic probation in order for a student to get off academic probation. Mignone commented that the two-semester policy seemed very burdensome and would affect students who study abroad for two semesters, and reiterated his frustration that policy is driven by the fact that Banner can't be programmed in certain ways. Burke reminded the committee that the policy had to be voted on today. Bakanic said she was troubled by details such as a student who studied abroad in junior year not being able to come back to redeem a bad grade received in the spring of sophomore year. Burke offered the option of taking the proposal back to the Registrar to recommend that students have more than two semesters to redeem a course. Chaffin wondered whether the two-semester rule would increase petitions to this committee. Cherry said that if a student withdraws from a course in which he or she is doing poorly, that would not count towards the four courses that could be redeemed.

Mignone asked Peeples for his opinion of the policy; Peeples said that he thought it gave students something new (that they previously did not have recourse to), and that it would benefit some students even if in some situations students could not use the policy. Mignone asked Boyle for her opinion; she agreed with Peeples. Burke said it now seemed that members of the committee thought the document was fine and asked for a vote on the two-semester requirement. 6 members voted for the requirement, and 1 against it.

**Student Petitions**

**Petitions for Late Withdrawal:**

**Student S.C.:** The committee voted unanimously to deny the petition as it currently stands, but to ask the student for further justification for why the courses in question need to be taken at Trident Technical College.

**Student B.B.:** petition was approved by a supermajority  online

**Student A.M.:** petition was approved unanimously

Burke said that he would ask the Senate to charge next year’s committee with finishing the policy on grade redemption. He alerted the committee that questions about CLEP exams would be discussed in upcoming meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20.

*Respectfully submitted by Deborah Boyle*
FCAS Committee Meeting, 4/19/17

Attending: Von Bakanic, Quinn Burke (Chair), LaTasha Chaffin, Bob Mignone, Scott Peeples, Ricard Viñas-de-Puig, Michelle Futrell (ex officio), Shannon MacKenzie (ex officio)

Called to order: 4:05 pm

Approval of Minutes of April 5, 2017 – Approved with small editorial changes.

Student Petitions:
Associate Provost Lynn Cherry overturned the committee’s decision on the petition of student VG.

Late Withdrawal Petitions

Student R.C. – The committee requested more information from the professor. The decision was delayed. Members R. Mignone & S. McKenzie will follow up with professor to get clarification/corroboration.

Student J.S. – Voted to unanimously approve the petition (6-0).

Student K.A. – Voted to unanimously approve the petition for a selective withdrawal (6-0).

Student C.D. – Voted to unanimously approve the petition (6-0).

Senior Course Elsewhere

Student A.B. – The committee voted to approve Chem 111 & 112 but not Math 105 since the Math class is offered as a distance course this summer.

Student E.V. – There was a question about whether it was necessary for the committee to approve the course. Michelle Futrell & Shannon McKenzie will check.

Adjourned: 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Von Bakanic