The Faculty Committee for Academic Standards Meeting
Dean’s Conference Room, 86 Wentworth St.
4:00 p.m., September 6, 2017

Members Present: Quinn Burke (Committee Chair, Teacher Education), Von Bakanic (Sociology), Deborah Boyle (Philosophy), Christine Byrum (Biology), LaTasha Chaffin (Political Science), Ricard Viñas De Puig (Hispanic Studies), Bob Mignone (Mathematics).

Also Attending: Lynn Cherry (Assoc. Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources), Michelle Futrell (Director, Undergraduate Academic Services), Alexandra Helfgott (SGA President), Shannon McKenzie (Assistant Director, Undergraduate Academic Services).

1– Introductory Comments
Burke had members review standard protocol for the FCAS and noted that there are currently 7 members on the committee (we will have 8 with a student in the future). In meetings, 5 individuals are needed for a simple majority. When considering student petitions online, 6 are needed for a supermajority. In the case of a tied outcome, the vote goes to the student. If students wish to appeal a decision, they must take the issue to Academic Affairs (unless the FCAS indicates that they would reconsider the petition after the student submits a revised version).

2– Discussion of the +/- Grading Scale
Cherry updated the committee on the status of the +/- grading scale. In the past, the Board of Trustees asked for a review of the College’s grading system. They wanted to know whether our student GPAs have benefited (or have been lowered) from having a +/- system. Last year Provost McGee asked the faculty to form an ad hoc committee to review data relevant to this issue and to determine how the College of Charleston compared to other schools. The ad hoc committee concluded that over the last 10 years, student GPAs haven’t decreased, but that there have been slight increases in GPA among both resident and non-resident students. The ad hoc committee also considered effects of this change on scholarship retention. Retention of Life Scholarships was comparable to that among Clemson and USC students. Also, CofC students tended to remain at the College even if they lost their Life Scholarships (this did not happen as often at Clemson or USC). Some of the Board of Trustees members expressed concerns that the +/- system may be hurting students and have asked Academic Standards to look at the report. The Board would like to meet with FCAS representatives in October and find out what conclusions we draw since Academic Standards was the committee that proposed changing the grading system. (The Faculty Senate chose the +/- grading system.) Implementation of the
system was initially delayed so that students could adjust. The current version was first implemented in 2006. Cherry will share the report with Burke and the Board of Trustees has requested that someone be available to respond to questions at the October meeting. Discussion by the FCAS committee followed. Cherry and Helfgott stepped out during the review of student petitions. Rejoined meeting afterwards.

3- Review of Student Petitions
Burke noted that the Late Withdrawal Petitions of JH and CG both seemed straightforward and suggested that the committee return to these after discussing others (if there was time) or vote online (both petitions were later approved online). Late Withdrawal Petition of DA was discussed and approved unanimously. The FCAS advised that the student work more closely with her professors and the SNAP office in the future to prevent similar situations from arising. Late Withdrawal Petition of EF was discussed and approved unanimously. Late Withdrawal Petition of CB was discussed and denied unanimously. KS Petition for Late Withdrawal was approved 5:1. Cherry and Helfgott returned to the meeting:

4- Discussion of Grade Redemption Policy
Proposed modification of the College’s Grade Redemption Policy was discussed. Recommended revisions included taking out the phrase “grade redemption is not grade forgiveness,” and making changes to be more economical with language. Cherry informed the committee that although the Registrar’s office supports the proposed changes, they couldn’t implement the policy before Fall 2019 due to lack of personnel. She also informed the committee that Banner would not be able to implement the policy such that redeemed grades wouldn’t count towards honors (as recommended by the committee last year) and suggested modifying the proposal in a way that is feasible for the Registrar’s office. Committee members considered alternative approaches and it was decided that the committee would go ahead and submit the proposal without language about honor rolls, honor societies, and the Honors College. The committee unanimously approved submission of the revised grade redemption policy to the Senate.

5- Concerns about CofC’s Minor Residency
Dr. Doug Friedman (International Studies) has proposed to revise wording so that non-resident study abroad courses could also be considered acceptable for credit towards a minor. Currently 9 hours at the 200-level or above must be earned in residence at CofC. Cherry reminded the committee that SACs requires the 200-level coursework with a minimum of 9 hours earned in residence at the College. Exceptions have been made for International Studies minors in the past with the understanding that International Studies will revise their program to include more 200 level coursework. Burke offered to check in with Doug Friedman about the issue. After further discussion it was decided that the matter would be tabled until the next meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for September 20th.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christine Byrum
Minutes of Faculty Committee on Academic Standards Meeting  
Wednesday, September 20, 2017  
School of Education, Dean’s Conference Room  

Attending: Von Bakanic; Deborah Boyle; Quinn Burke (Chair); Christine Byrum; LaTasha Chaffin; Bob Mignone; Ricard Viñas de Puig; Michelle Futrell (ex officio); Shannon McKenzie (ex officio); Jimmie Foster, Jr., Vice-President for Enrollment Planning (Guest)

The meeting began at 4:10 p.m.

College-Wide Transfer Policy: Foster explained that according to the College’s current transfer policy, the College will not admit any student applying to the College who is not permitted, for either academic or disciplinary reasons, to return to their current institution. For example, the College will not consider applications from students expelled from military or religious institutions for violations for which the College of Charleston would not expel a student. Foster presented a proposal to change the policy’s language to allow students with disciplinary violations at their previous institutions to apply to the College; the Application Safety Association Committee (ASAC)—which is chaired by Foster and the Dean of Students and whose members include the College Chief of Police, the Faculty Senate Speaker, and the College’s legal counsel—could then hear the student’s case and make a determination regarding whether the student may apply for admission. He gave the example of a student with one strike at his/her current institution for marijuana possession, who, under the current policy, would not be allowed to apply to the College. This policy change would apply only to students with institutional disciplinary actions, not misdemeanors (unless those resulted in an institutional disciplinary action).

Futrell asked whether this policy change would apply to students with Honor Code violations at their previous institutions; Foster answered that it would not. The proposed policy change would apply only to students with disciplinary violations. Bakanic asked whether students who had committed sexual assault while at another institution could be permitted to apply to the College under this proposed policy; Foster said that they could, but that in past cases of that sort, students had appealed and that all cases had been denied. He said they had received many applications from prison.

Mignone asked about students who could not return to their current institutions for academic reasons. He questioned whether the College would not want a student who had been kicked out of Harvard for academic reasons. Foster pointed out that a student who had been kicked out of a school like Harvard would have to attend a community college for six credit hours and do well there before applying to the College; he said that such cases do not happen often. Foster said that in the future the College could consider a change in policy regarding cases where students were not permitted to attend their previous institutions for academic reasons.
Foster clarified that the current College policy is that students wishing to transfer to the College must be eligible to attend their previous institution, not just eligible to reapply to it.

Bakanic asked what would happen if students who had served their sentence for a conviction applied to the College. Foster said that the ASAC committee would review the case, but that it is voluntary for students to reveal that information. He pointed out that the admissions committees at some institutions will review the applications of potential transfer students based on their high school records, especially if the student had fewer than 30 credit hours at their previous college or university.

The committee discussed what the proposed policy change language meant by “other relevant parties.” Foster said that that language came from legal counsel. The committee also discussed the meaning of the proposed language that students with disciplinary violations would be “conditionally considered for admission” to the College. Some committee members pointed out that this language was vague. Foster said that it does not mean that a student would be considered for conditional admission; nor does it mean that a student conditionally considered for admission could take classes at the College. McKenzie said that it seemed to mean that the admissions committee would not be able to make a decision about an applicant’s case if the applicant has pending charges.

The committee also discussed applicants’ abilities under the current policy to appeal a denied application. Foster said that students with disciplinary violations are currently allowed to appeal their denied applications, but that the appeals are always denied. If the policy is changed, such applications would be considered by the ASAC committee. Chaffin asked if the current policy’s language implies that all applicants will be considered; Foster said that it has been interpreted to mean that if a student admits to having been removed from his or her previous institution due to an academic or disciplinary violation, the application receives an automatic denial. This is also true if the student is removed from his/her institution due to a misdemeanor or felony conviction. If a misdemeanor or felony conviction did not result in the student being removed from the institution, the student’s application must be reviewed by ASAC, but is not automatically denied.

The committee also discussed whether this proposed policy would affect graduate programs. Foster clarified that at the undergraduate level, admission is never a departmental issue. The proposed change in the language would apply just to undergraduate admissions; the admissions policies for graduate students are different.

Mignone volunteered to write up the old policy language and the proposed new language and put it on the agenda for the next FCAS meeting. Bakanic asked that Legal Affairs be asked what “conditionally” means in the new language.

Cross-listed Courses and the “No Repeat” Policy
Mignone introduced a request from the Math Department to FCAS to make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate for a change in the course numbering policy. Some 400- and 500-level courses with the same content are offered concurrently, but, in accordance with SACS requirements, have different performance expectations, different assessments, and different syllabi for students at the
undergraduate and graduate levels. Current College policy is that students who take a course at the 400-level may not repeat that course at the 500-level for credit. However, Mignone explained, that policy poses a problem for graduate students at the College who were previously undergraduates here -- although not for graduate students who took a similar course as undergraduates at a different institution. Students who completed a College of Charleston 400-level course (even decades ago) and apply to attend a College graduate program that requires the same course at the 500-level would not be permitted to take that course for credit, whereas students transferring in to the same graduate program who took the equivalent 400-level course (no matter when) would be allowed to take the 500-level for credit here. This has the effect that the Math department cannot admit its own students to Math graduate programs.

The committee discussed which students would be affected by the proposed policy change. Byrum said that the Biology department has a way around this problem, so the policy would not affect their students. Mignone said that students in the 4+1 combined B.S./M.S. program in Math would not be affected; when a student in that program takes a 400-level course, it counts double; that is, the student takes it at the undergraduate level but receives graduate credit for it.

Mignone said that there are two ways to deal with the problem. First, the course number policy could be changed so that it is level-dependent. Second, the Office of the Registrar could allow a special waiver under such circumstances. However, the Registrar no longer allows such waivers. Thus the Math Department is requesting a change in the course numbering policy such that the no-repeat policy would only apply to courses within one degree level. Burke asked if adding the words “within a degree program” to the current policy would be enough. Mignone thought it might be. The committee intends to return to this issue.

Student Petitions for Late Withdrawal:
- Student T.K: petition was denied by a 6-0 vote with one abstention.
- Student A.G.: the committee requested further documentation before voting.

Update on College Minor Residency Requirements
Burke reported that he had followed up with Doug Friedman about his proposal to revise the wording of the minor residency policy. Friedman will attend the Oct. 4 meeting to address the committee.

Update on the +/- Grading Scale Policy Review
Burke said that he would send committee members a report issued by an ad hoc faculty committee last year regarding the effects of the change in the grading system ten years ago. It may be necessary to set up an ad hoc committee of three members of FCAS to review it, if the report is very long.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25.

Respectfully submitted by Deborah Boyle
Minutes – Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid Committee
Wednesday October 4, 2017
4 p.m. School of Education, Dean’s Conference Room

In attendance: Deborah Boyle, Quinn Burke (Chair), LaTasha Chaffin, Jesse "Tripp" Keeffe, Bob Mignone, Ricard Viñas-de-Puig, Michelle Futrell (Ex-officio), Shannon McKenzie (Ex-officio), Doug Friedman, Chair, International Studies Program (Guest)
Minutes taken by LaTasha Chaffin

1. Introduction of New SGA Representative Jesse "Tripp" Keeffe

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from September 20, 2017

It was clarified that the ASAC acronym was indicative of the Applicant Safety Assessment Committee. The minutes from the September 20, 2017 meeting were unanimously approved.

3. Plus-Minus Grading System

Quinn – indicated that the concern from some members of the board of directors is that this policy has hurt some students. However, according to Jim Posey, the Associate VP for Institutional Research, Planning and Information Management, the policy initially hurt those B or better however this issue is now resolved based on the data from the report they provided.
Deborah – In the report provided, I am wondering why they specifically looked at students that were South Carolina residents - individual students versus how grades affected classes
They looked at students with an average of B or better vs. courses with an average of B or better
Bob – They wanted to see the effect of grades on individual students. The graph showed a sharp drop. It could have been the +/- system or faculty could have adjusted for this over time. There also may have been grade inflation at a certain point
Deborah – The graph overall reflects data about student performance in courses, yet the report is about B’s earned by individual students
Bob - Retention was an issue. I would expect the overall courses and individual students should be correlated
Deborah - I would have liked some explanation regarding the differences
Quinn - I will communicate this to Lynn. The board will be meeting at some point. There is at a steep drop, now B’s and above are increasing every year since then. To Bob’s point, it’s going in the opposite direction. I can generate some language to this effect.
Bob - What is happening at the C, D & F level? It would be good to see the overall trends there as well.
Shannon - They are looking at first year students. We are seeing more students that lose their life scholarship in the 2nd year (or beyond).
Bob - They look at B’s & A’s for all students; they filter out retention for first year students
Shannon - Transfer students coming in are losing their life scholarship. They may retain it at another institution or a technical college & lose it when they come to the College. We only see a microcosm of students in our office - however this is what we see - some students that lose it were transfer students during their first semester
Quinn - It was about a 6% drop that occurred in students' grades
Ricard – The drop on the graph can be misleading. How do we know how many students were affected?
Bob - The chart shows an effect on the retention of life scholarships. The negative effect was on grades and retention. Yet they have now gone back up.
Quinn - I will communicate that we reviewed it, bring up Deborah’s question & write up a communication regarding our review of the findings that the report was soundly written.
Vote: There was a vote of confidence in continuing the +/- program based on the report: Ricard, LaTasha, Deborah, Quinn & Trip (Approved); Bob abstained.
Discussion regarding the +/- system continued.
Bob - The report says that the +/- system has detrimentally affected the students - in the long-term yes, but in the short term, I don’t know if I agree with that statement.
Ricard - The report does not include data that indicates what the trends would be if we had not changed to a +/- system. Would a B- be a B- for the same students in courses prior to the change?
Bob - You can’t tell. Because a B could have been an 80 prior to the change and with the +/- system a B could still be an 80 or for others (professors) a B would be an 83 & a B- is now an 80. We don't know who did that & who didn’t
Quinn - Someone suggested that we normalize the (grading) scale & I did not think that would be a good policy
Quinn - I recommend to Lynn that she may want to change the final paragraph (1st sentence) which is the language about the +/- system being non-detrimental.
Bob - I suggest that we simply state that we recommend that we continue with the +/- system
Quinn - I will note that we recommend that we continue with the +/- system

4. College-wide Transfer Policy
Quinn – There was a proposed change through the Applicant Safety Assessment Committee (ASAC) regarding the consideration of criminal or disciplinary history. Institutions differ in terms of what they consider for admissions
Shannon & Michelle - The "Policy for Applicants for Undergraduate Admission" (12.1.6) is found at Policy.cofc.edu under “Student” and “Academic”
The language from the existing policy was compared to the proposed language.
"Special circumstances.... Paragraph is it related to the entire previous paragraph or the sentence before

Bob – I am wondering whether the “special circumstances considered” applies to the previous paragraph or the sentence before it – these special circumstances might relate to an academic disciplinary suspension that one might not deem appropriate
Deborah - I think Jimmie said it applies to the sentence before
Quinn - I don’t think it changes the meaning of the text. We indicated to Jimmie Foster that "other relevant parties" needs clarification. This could pertain to the police...& so forth.
Deborah - Is this policy stricter - the existing policy indicates that students can’t be serving disciplinary or academic suspensions & in the new one it discusses criminal violations (students that may not be disciplined by their school)
Michelle - Applicants are asked to disclose criminal violations; yet it is self-reported. We have dismissed students who have not reported (this history) & we found out later
Shannon – Also students sign & date the application
Michelle – Therefore it would be an honor code violation not to disclose
Deborah – The statement...conditionally considered for admission, should be in accordance "with" not "to"
Vote: There was a vote to approve the changes to the college-wide transfer policy with the minor change to language that Deborah indicated. There was unanimous approval.

5. Minor Residency Policy
Doug Friedman, Chair of the International Studies program joined the meeting.
Quinn – Doug, thank you for taking the opportunity to meet with us. I understand that one of the issues is making 200 courses available to students earlier in academic career to be more prepared for study abroad
Another issue is will exceptions become the rule. We wanted to gain your perspectives.
Doug - The exception exists already. What does it apply to? For a long time it applied to study abroad.
Very recently it has been a different interpretation. The proposal is to make it explicit that it is talking about study abroad
Bob - What does the policy currently state?
Doug provided a copy of the current policy
Michelle read the policy aloud “Unique courses appropriate for the minor, but not otherwise offered at the College may be considered for approval as exceptions to the minor residency policy. Likewise, a set of courses completed elsewhere may be approved as exceptions to the minor residency policy if when considered in the whole they compromise a unique curricular experience not available at the College. Senior-Year Residency policies apply."

Doug – We use affiliate programs as we don't always have the faculty capacity to teach study abroad courses. It does count if it is our (CofC faculty-led) program. However we also hire faculty members in Chile & Buenos Aires to teach our students.
Quinn - I take this (study abroad) course & I am asking the College to transfer into an existing 200 level class
Doug - They always do. We were told they cannot be transferred into regular college of Charleston classes. In the past we were encouraged to do so. In many cases they transferred as special topics classes. However if they transfer to courses in the catalog, they would not be considered unique. The uniqueness - is the fact that they (the courses) are there (abroad).
Bob - This would not work for a course that we had exactly the same course for.
Doug - My contention is that they would be different
Quinn referenced the new proposed minor policy language and reads the addition "and typically, though not exclusively, earned in a study abroad program."
Quinn - What are the barriers of getting more 200+ courses?
Doug - Students would have to take more courses & extend their time here
Quinn - I am in education - I have to tell my advises if they want to study abroad - they have to start looking for 200 level courses early
Doug - Are you proposing that they take the 200 level courses here?
Quinn - No, yet some have made the argument that it is sensible
Doug - Some 100 or 200 level courses are (cross-listed) together
LaTasha - What are the residency requirements?
Doug - Three 200 level courses in their minor here in residency
LaTasha – Are most study abroad classes at the 200 level?
Doug - Yes & we are reluctant to transfer in 100 level courses; electives are taken from everywhere (other departments) 100 level course are specific to our curriculum
LaTasha – Is the issue that affiliate programs are used?
Doug - We don't have enough faculty; there is a fairly small number of students affected by this; maybe not our majors – it could be an international business students that are required to take a minor, or a language minor, or a regional studies minor; that are AACSB approved. There are not many study abroad programs in business (e.g. European studies - minor - go to Germany & take business courses, language in Germany & want to apply them to their minor)
Quinn - What is the current process?
Doug – It is kind of arbitrary; we apply for an exception & then the Associate Provost reviews it based on what criteria I don't know. I write a letter indicating that the course is unique - being abroad & taking the courses in another country, and explain the program. They could say no but I don't know why.
Deborah - Even with the exception, wouldn't there be a distinction about what is unique?
Quinn - It seems like there is a tension between unique & equivalency.
Doug - This experience is unique to that what they would get at CofC. Study abroad falls in that category. There is the Washington program – which could apply to a minor - it is unique yet it is not study abroad.
Quinn - As a group we think that study abroad is important yet we have to look at the broad policy
Bob - A student studying abroad in Canada - taking statistics that is offered at the college - would that not count?
Doug - I would think not – it would be hard to argue that there is some cultural content there
Doug - It is not fair for students to go on study abroad and take courses that they think will count & get back & apply for an exception & it won't.
Quinn - Unique means not equivalent - it seems like there may need some wordsmithing
Ricard – Depending on how you look at it all courses are unique.
Bob - I interpret the uniqueness as studying abroad
Ricard – Then why not just say “courses taken abroad”
Quinn - I think the issue is, if it is unique - how is brought over as an equivalent CofC class?
Bob – The policy says appropriate to the minor; not equivalent. An equivalent course is offered at the college
Doug - Sometimes there are - Politics of Latin America is offered here - but to take it in Brazil or Chile is different experience.
Deborah – However, does that speak to the quality of the course?
Ricard - What if the instructor was Brazilian & the course was offered here in Charleston?
Doug - I think the place matters
LaTasha - I think some of the uniqueness comes in where the students stay with a host family
Ricard - That is not part of the course
Doug - It is not part of the course, yet that is part of the 2nd half of the proposal where courses are offered together
LaTasha - Have exceptions applied for - all been approved?
Doug - So far yes
Bob - Maybe you can take a course in N. Charleston - yet we are talking about Doug wanting us to consider the experience as part of the course
Deborah – Which is a different question
Bob - We can separate out the experience from the course
Michelle - The question is one of residency

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.
Next meeting Wednesday October 18th
Minutes – Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid Committee
Wednesday October 18, 2017
4 p.m. School of Education, Dean’s Conference Room
In attendance: Von Bakanic, Christine Byrum, Quinn Burke (Chair), LaTasha Chaffin, Jesse
“Tripp” Keefe, Bob Mignone, Ricard Via-de-Puig, Michelle Futrell (Ex-officio), Shannon
McKenzie (Ex-officio),
Minutes taken by T. Keefe

QB-Reviewing prior notes to begin
● Bob-still issues with board report on plus/minus system
  ○ Hurt students in past, noted but ultimately nothing to change now
● QB-no point wordsmithing the policy, should continue, all agree
  ○ Small change in spelling, otherwise approved
  ○ Ricard motions to approve, Tripp seconds
● Christine-question: policy discussions new? Why this new thing?
  ○ QB-yes, new focus comes from Provost McGee as student petitions become
    largely online
  ● Bob-we pick up policies that seem to fall between the cracks of other committees’
    purviews
  Bob-“No Repeat” policy for cross-listed courses
  ○ As cross listed courses for grad and undergrad classes are similar, need
    provosts permission to retake
  ○ Want resolved with an exception-distinguish between 400 and 500 level courses
● QB-for clarification, couldn’t accept 400 level course work and couldn’t take 500 level
  course for credit without provost’s approval which is rare
  ● Bob-correct
  ○ Currently-cannot have credit for both 400 and 500 level course due to similarity
● Christine-could we add a phrase that graduate program can choose to waive
  requirements in this context
  ○ Currently, the marine bio program does this at graduate director or graduate
    committee’s discretion
  ● Bob-this would be ideal
  ● Von-orivist would like having waivers placed in the hands of the steering committee for
    graduate programs rather than all in his hands
  ● QB- Bob could you add that language to your proposal
  ● All agree with this language change
  ● Bob will have new language ready at next meeting

Undergrad certificate policy
● QB-one thing I see in policy to discuss, mostly straightforward, anything else to discuss?
  ● Bob-6.1 “without regard to admission status” what does this mean?
  ● Michele-perhaps means whether they are degree seeking or not?
  ● LaTasha-11.1 says there is a procedure that they must use undergrad application
    process, so does admissions status matter or not? Unclear in policy
  ○ Do they apply or don’t apply? Through what application process?
Bob - language should be more clear on this

Michele - Currently non-degree seeking students can be dismissed based on grades, per policy 6.3 these certificate students seemingly cannot be

LaTasha - 7.0, is this a matter of fees?

Bob - no standards listed, says "complete" a course for credit but complete could be with an F, should instead say "successfully complete"

QB - we can suggest 7.0 say pass each course

QB - will ask for clarification about 6.1

Christine - a few questions, first, policy says no more than 6 transfer credits can be used to complete the 12 credit requirement, this is a big chunk, is that okay?

QB - requests changing language to say "25% of courses can be transferred in"

Bob - this could turn away some students

Von - % can be hard to determine for some courses based on varying credit hours

Bob - Should leave as is, surely the discussed this, we could ask for their rationale

Christine - other concerns, will certificates pressure faculty to do applied coursework rather than academic coursework?

○ Students could focus on accruing certificates rather than really learning and engrossing themselves in the material

LaTasha - certificate program could be focused towards non-traditional students, we should ask for the rationale

Michele - currently certificate seekers do apply through admissions

Bob - certificate about expertise, doesn't matter so much where expertise came from

QB - senate hasn't decided on this yet

Bob - seems a curriculum committee thing, not us

QB - we will give our feedback and discussion, application and certificates/practical education is the way of the future for higher ed, but problematic for the traditional educational approach, this should be discussed

Bob - could also be an issue for academic planning

QB - will ask about clarification for 6.3

QB - about 4.5, what is the point? Making sure one doesn't pick and choose?

Bob - point could be making it coherent?

Von - already small credit requirements and very specific, couldn't really subdivide much

QB - makes sense, avoiding excessive subdivision and excessive double-dipping through 4.5

Ricard - can course count for multiple different certificates?

Seems to be the point of 4.5

QB - have curriculum committee review it

Minor residency requirement policy

Bob - Tim said that people can take all 200 level classes for intl studies abroad currently

QB - perhaps tim and doug should talk about this before we vote to approve

LaTasha - is this just an issue for Intl studies and not other departments?

○ Solution could be less 100 level prereqs in this department
Ricard-aren’t all courses really unique?

QB-if the courses are transferable they aren’t truly unique really, “unique-ish”

✓ Doug should think this through more, perhaps LaTasha is right

✓ Bob—he should work this out with Tim and have one language proposal from the whole of international studies

✓ LaTasha—perhaps we should hear from Intl Business too

✓ QB—will send back to Doug to bring a proposal from Intl business and Intl studies as a whole

✓ Ricard—any proposal should come from all affected programs

✓ QB—agreed

Minutes January 30, 2018. Faculty Committee on Academic Standards

Meeting called to order at 4:05 in 3rd floor conference room School of Education

Attending: Von Bakanic, Deborah Boyle, Michelle Futrell (ex officio), Shannon McKenzie (ex officio), Bob Mignone

Student Petitions – All outstanding petitions have been decided via OAKS.

Late Withdrawal
Student P.C. Approved unanimously (7-0)
Student L.H. Denied unanimously (7-0)
Student M.M. Approve unanimously (7-0)
Student B.D. Approved (6-0)

Senior course elsewhere
Student D.F. Approved (6-0)
Student E.D. Approved (6-0)

Adjourned 4:15

Next Meeting 2/13/18

Respectfully submitted by Von Bakanic
Minutes – Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid Committee
Tuesday April 3, 2018
4 p.m. School of Education
In attendance:
Deborah Boyle, Quinn Burke (Chair), LaTasha Chaffin, Madelyn "Maddie" Middleton, Bob Mignone, Ricard Viñas-de-Puig, Michelle Futrell (Ex-officio), Shannon McKenzie (Ex-officio), Dr. Allison E. Sterrett-Krause (Guest), Dean Cabot (Guest)
Minutes taken by LaTasha Chaffin

Meeting called to order 4:10 p.m.

Minutes approved from January 30, 2018 meeting

Quinn – Our new undergraduate representative is Maddie. Welcome Maddie. We also have two guests Dr. Allison E. Sterrett-Krause & Dean Cabot here to discuss the College Honor Code Policy.

1. Honor Code Policy Revisions

Allison – The honor board wanted more flexibility in assigning sanctions. The weight of assignments has decreased in syllabi & the honor board was uncomfortable assigning XXF for an assignment worth 5% when the student educated themselves & made corrections

Our ad hoc committee examined 20 - 25 peer institutions and made recommendations to the honor board.

1) They liked our recommendation to widen the span of Class 2 violations (involve minimal conspiracy - e.g. buying a paper). We suggested adding an XX grade which indicates academic dishonesty - yet it wasn't on the final paper or a conspiracy to cheat - & you can demonstrate that you have the knowledge to make corrections. This provides the honor board with the flexibility they want

2) Qualitative labels to allow faculty & students to know the severity of a class 1, 2 or 3

3) A second violation - currently is a class one (e.g. Using a calculator or google translate when not supposed to) - penalty can be up to and including expulsion. We have lessened this penalty from including expulsion.

4) We added a table (we benchmarked this from peer institutions)

Dean Cabot (DC) – The XSF put in place in Fall 2006. Our number of reports have not change pre- & post-XSF. We don't look different than peer institutions - most faculty don't report across institutions. I think that this new developmental tool in the class 2 options may encourage more faculty to report

Bob - I can see this. Most faculty don't want to heavily penalize students & choose to deal with this themselves

What about peer institutions such as William & Mary?
DC - We were on the stricter side. No set guidelines. The mitigating circumstances weighed heavily & you can get different outcomes

Quinn - I has a freshman accused of plagiarizing & my Chair said we had to go forward. I felt bad.

The class 3 is pretty clear - the class 1 & 2 there is grey

DC - It always is

Quinn - A faculty member can be upset with student attendance or for other reasons & push for more severity

DC - The board decides, not the faculty member

Deborah - Faculty could suggest a more severe class & the class could change?

DC - Yes & the faculty member will be there when/ if suggest the board suggests a class change

DC - This new language takes into consideration a first offense or freshman status for example (the current system only looks at the nature of the offense)

Deborah - It doesn’t appear that it is built into the policy that the weight of the assignment matters

DC – There are a list of variables the board can consider & one is the weight of the assignment

Allison - Class 2 - we changed "premeditation and conspiracy of effort" to "minimal premeditation" - e.g. Student stuffs a notecard in pocket outside the class when they find out through a discussion with other students that they studied something they didn’t vs. premeditated prepared note sheet brought in the class.

Quinn – If I get a serious XF & the board removes; am I a second offender or a first offender

Allison - A second offender because it is on academic record

DC - It is on your conduct file & transcript

Bob - My assumption is after so many years, on the transcript - the XF goes away

DC - True, it depends on when you make the snapshot

Bob – It does not matter however if it is the on transcript or not – the second offense is on the record

Quinn - Can we track this?

DC - Yes

Quinn - Can we note this on the policy; so a student can’t say it’s expunged off their record.

Allison- I will make a notation on the policy that the record of academic dishonesty will be noted on the conduct record
Ricard - What is the point of eliminating it then?

DC - We keep records for 7 years, then we implement our record keeping policy; we only answer the questions regarding this that are asked for internships, study abroad, employment etc.

Deborah - Seniors want to graduate school - they have to wait a year for it to be removed - is their record clean?

DC - Yes if they ask - the student is asked to sign a release to provide information about their conduct record; some (e.g. law schools & study abroad) ask about misconduct ever, or the last seven years

LaTasha - Is it for each inquiry that students are required to complete a release?

DC – For the common app, it is one release for others there is a release for each inquiry

Ricard - In class 3 offenses, there is some agreement between professor & a student. The other two classes the result may not have this agreement - correct?

DC - No - faculty members can list class three, or choose to consult with me. Most faculty are unsure - they turn the case over & see if there is sufficient evidence for the charge (98% there are). The hearing by the honor board determines the class.

Ricard - The student & faculty member sign stating they understand the class?

DC - Yes but the faculty member gets to determine the outcome. Upset students are sent to the Chair of the department.

Michelle - could there be a grievance filed?

DC - Yes

DC - This committee (FCAS) has to bring it forward to the faculty senate. I can be there. It will be next academic year.

Quinn - I won’t be chairing- year 3. Are we ready for a vote?

LaTasha - If exonerated then does it still show up on the conduct record?

DC - Not as a violation; no - yet they could still be a finding for a class 3 however - then yes

Maddie - If student admitted versus denied the misconduct- can this be taken into account? I sit on the honor board

DC - Yes it is one of the factors taken into account.

Maddie - is the student aware that their admittance is taken into account?

DC - Yes with intake & with their advisors

Allison - Class 2 - now wide sanctions - e.g. student takes educational class on plagiarism to failing the class. The weight of assignment & admittance would be taken into account
DC - We could put that guidance (about admittance vs. denial) on the website; yet I always think about how much protocol to put out there

Shannon - If they know they can game the system to affect what class is assigned

Quinn – We will add what language to the first bullet point, Dr. Kraus...

Allison- “information on responsibility for academic dishonesty will be maintained in student’s conduct record.”

Quinn vote to approve with the additional language?

Allison - If the faculty senate approves it - from Dean Cabot's perspective she is amenable to amending the handbook mid-year for the new policy to go into effect Spring 2019

*Unanimous to approve (hands raised).*

2. **Vote on Pending Requests**

   **Senior Course Elsewhere Petition**

Student J. K.

Quinn – We have one petition. Quick overview – the student wanted to take courses elsewhere - couched in financial terms. He came back & indicated mental issues & psychiatrist confirmed it. LaTasha, I think you asked about a new narrative.

He contacted me by phone & said he was embarrassed about the mental issues and therefore indicated financial issues in his statement. Do we want the student to revise his narrative? He has solid grades. However we need to be mindful of protocol - in the past I think we have allowed changes with the additional letter.

LaTasha - I am comfortable if you talked to him. The issue is that he did not indicate that he wanted to take classes at home to get treatment - the psychiatrist said this, yet in his letter he only mentioned financial reasons.

Ricard - The record will be a mis-match if he does not provide a new narrative

Deborah - He should revise the letter & state the real reason.
Quinn – We will make this request

   **Late Withdrawal Petitions**

Student J.H.

Quinn – There is a late withdrawal request- close family friend (Dad’s best friends wife committed suicide). The student did not withdraw in time. Yet he had numerous other withdrawals.

Shannon - I provided verification of SNAP approval. I did not provide documentation of ADHD yet it is there.
He uploaded a letter today & said the ADHD had no effect on missing the deadline. He indicated that the funeral was on the day of the withdrawal date & he was shaken up & missed it. However, the Summer II deadline was July 24th & funeral July 21st.

Debra – Then what he stated was untrue

LaTasha – Was this an online class?

Shannon - Two online classes. He had two incompletes from extended summer which may have prohibited him from doing well this class

Quinn – ADHD is not a credible argument - he was not diagnosed during the summer session & to Deborah’s points the dates he noted of the funeral & withdrawal dates were wrong

LaTasha – He said in his statement that ADHD was not an issue & he hinged his whole argument on the dates which was not accurate. I would vote to deny.

*Unanimous vote; 0-6 denial*

Meeting adjourned 4:55 p.m. Next meeting scheduled April 17th
Minutes of Academic Standards Committee  
April 17, 2018  
4:00 pm School of Education, 3rd floor lounge  

In attendance: Von Bakanic, LaTasha Chaffin, Madelyn 'Maddie' Middleton, Bob Mignone (serving as Chair), Ricard Viñas-de-Puig; Shannon McKenzie (ex-officio).  

Minutes taken by Ricard Viñas-de-Puig  

Meeting called to order at 4.08pm.  

Committee convened in Dean’s Conference Room, School of Education, 3rd floor lounge; Viñas-de-Puig self-nominated to serve as secretary.  

1. Vote on pending petitions  
   
   a. Late withdrawal petitions  
      ✓ Student E.M.:  
      A final decision to approve the student’s petition was approved online.  
      
      b. Senior course elsewhere petitions  
         ✓ Student A.B.S.:  
         After reviewing the additional medical documentation provided by the student, the committee members in attendance at the meeting voted to approve the student’s petition (5-0).  
         
         ✓ Student G.B.:  
         After some discussion on the courses the student is petitioning to take elsewhere in Fall 2018, Bakanic indicated that the student needs to be aware that the final decision on the acceptance of the transfer credits lies on the individual Departments - this is the case of the Lab credit for the Biology class the student intends to take elsewhere.  
         Chaffin stated that, as a one-time courtesy in consideration of the student’s professional career, she was in favor of approving the petition.  
         With these considerations noted, the committee members in attendance at the meeting voted to approve the student’s petition (5-0).  
         
         ✓ Student R.M.:  
         After some discussion on the nature of the travel the student intends to take over Summer 2018, the committee members in attendance at the meeting voted to request additional information on the nature of the student’s travel plans (5-0). A later vote will take place once this additional piece of information is received.  
         
         ✓ Student T.H.:  
         After some discussion on the details of the student’s petition, Bakanic indicated that she was in favor of approving the petition with the condition that the student enrolls in SPAN 202 offered online over Summer 2018 at CoC (instead of taking that course at Trident Technical College, as indicated in the student’s documentation).  
         With the condition stated above, the committee members in attendance at the meeting voted to approve the student’s petition (5-0).  
   
   2. Minutes of previous FCAS meeting
At the time of the meeting, Chaffin indicated that a minor change on one of the committee member’s name needs to be made to the minutes of the meeting held on April 3, 2018. The minutes from that meeting will be approved at the next FCAS meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 4.56pm

Respectfully submitted,

Ricard Viñas-de-Puig