

Idaho State University
Academic Standards Council
Minutes

Wednesday, November 5, 2008

3:00 PM

Faculty Senate Conference Room, REND 301

In Attendance: Denner, Enos, Ford, A. Frantz, B. Frantz, Germino, Jensen (ASISU), Johnson, Krumwiede, Mickelsen, Selvage (Chair), Stowe
Excused: Steiner, Swetnam (sabbatical)
Absent: Wabrek
Non-voting: Hertz, McKenzie, Allen (Recording Secretary), Wallace (Administrative Assistant), Wasden (Office Assistant)

1. Announcements

Joann Trimmer needs a faculty member to serve on the **University Admissions Appeals Committee**. The meetings are held on Thursdays 10:30-11:30 a.m. during November, December and the first week of January.

Lindsay Allen from the College of Technology Business Information program has agreed to be the recording secretary for this Council from now on.

2. Continuing Business

a. Scholastic Appeals Board procedural changes

ACTION: Denner moved **to approve the Scholastic Appeals Board protocol revisions**. The motion was not seconded as yet.

Discussion: Ford gave background on the subcommittee's work. He and Selvage incorporated most of the changes into the document under consideration. A. Frantz asked whether "registered mail" is necessary or feasible on campus. Wallace suggested hand delivery on campus is the best. The process is that the mail room signs for the mail, but that will not guarantee that the person will receive it. A. Frantz thought there should be clarification of whose responsibility it should be to ensure the receipt of notification. Mickelson said the Student Affairs Office normally handles all the communication regarding Academic Dishonesty cases.

Denner raised the issue of whether the policy section of the document is about the Scholastic Appeals Board or about scholastic appeals. He said that it appears to be about scholastic appeals but the authority of the Student Affairs office appears to be the beginning and the end of the process of handling appeals. He would change the document so that Section One describes the appeals process and Section Two describes what happens when the appeal goes to the Board and the role and charge of the Board in the process. If the appeal is terminated earlier by an agreement between the parties, that agreement should be documented. Mickelson suggested adapting wording from the Academic Dishonesty policy regarding the notification process to keep the two policies consistent.

There was some discussion about who does and/or should have the final decision-making authority – the Board or a Vice President. Ford recommended that there should be clearly defined, documented procedures that are to be followed. It might make sense to slightly rewrite major heading One and Two, clearly outlining the appeals process and what happens when it reaches the Appeals Board. A. Frantz pointed out another item for discussion in regards to when the appeals process actually starts, since there is the informal process of appealing to the Dean for resolution before the formal appeal process is initiated. He suggested clarification should be made in cases of an incomplete grade, perhaps changing the wording to read: "**when the grade is posted.**"

Denner noted that the form is better than what the document describes in terms of what needs to take place and be documented. It should be clear in Section One how an appeal is started, the steps of the appeal, and the steps involved in terminating an appeal.

A. Frantz brought up that the wording in the graduate appeals process would be important to have in this document and that clarification should be made as to what the Dean is allowed to do, such as to call a hearing if necessary. This process might also be important at the department chair level. There was some discussion how to handle cases involving graduate students and adjunct faculty in clinical or field practice who are no longer employed by ISU. Stowe recommended that a straw vote would be useful so that whoever rewrites the process would have an indication of what the Council prefers. Stowe also suggested striking “**neither peer review nor committee.**”

Selvage and Ford argued that there is value in specifying what the Board can and cannot consider. A. Frantz noted that an appeal should not be filed based on subjective opinion. Germino recommended that the University has other ways of enforcing quality teaching and that the mechanism not be something to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. A. Frantz asked the question when do faculty members have the right to appeal a grade overturning before it gets to the Board. The grade needs to be protected but the appeals boards appears to say we have to agree with the student. Ford stated that if a grade is overturned, there are other effective avenues for faculty to appeal grade changes. Ford saw this as a very fair process and not every appeal will go all the way to the scholastic appeals board. It would be a truly exceptional situation that does not happen more than once or twice a year.

ACTION: Peter Denner moved **to table the proposal and remand it to the subcommittee for further work.** Larry Ford seconded the motion. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Larry Ford recommended keeping the statement “**the Board is neither a peer review nor an evaluator of teacher effectiveness**”. The Council members took a straw poll. Ten were in favor of the motion, one was against. The statement was retained in the document.

b. Revised draft Early College Program Questionnaires for ISU Departments/Faculty and High School Teachers

Ford mentioned that he received a copy of the questionnaire just before this meeting started. He questioned whether the adjuncts would fill out the surveys. Wallace mentioned that there were problems brought up in Council last year and the Council wanted input from the High School teachers. She mentioned that this questionnaire was a mechanism to get that input. Ford had to leave early and was excused.

c. Banner Implementation Questions: Wait-listing

McKenzie responded to some questions that had been brought up about the Banner implementation about how the prioritization of students could be managed by Banner. McKenzie said that rules need to be written to allow for priority order of wait-lists. The registration office has ways of overriding wait-lists. A determination needs to be made in regards to which courses need an overall standard for determining wait-listing. The students pay for the Banner project, and it was McKenzie’s goal to service the students and faculty by helping them manage their wait-lists. She said the Registrar could always do manual overrides when necessary. Germino noted that his department wants these options. Denner suggested that the department chairs should decide which courses need wait-lists and which ones do not. Department chairs will also have ways of checking to see how many students are on the wait-lists, which will help them decide whether to open an additional section of a particular course.

ACTION: Alan Frantz moved **that the Academic Standards Committee recommend wait-listing first by pre-requisite checks, then by class level; to be determined by department chairs which courses would be wait-listed; and to allow time conflicts between wait-list and registered classes.** Denner seconded the motion. The Council members voted. Ten were in favor of the motion, one was against. No discussion. The motion was **passed** with a majority vote.

d. Readmissions Policy

Hertz said the Readmission Committee has not met yet. There was no discussion about this item.

e. Subcommittees' updates

1) **ISU Transcript Credit Policies subcommittee**

Mickelsen reported the Transcript subcommittee met yesterday with the Dean of the College of Technology who explained her take on work experience and translating that into credits. The subcommittee then asked the Dean questions about experience, the time spent towards gaining that experience, about the national registry exams they take, and how that relates to other health care professions. The Dean will take those questions into consideration and will address those items at the next subcommittee meeting on November 17. Mickelsen and Enos will report back at the next Academic Standards Council meeting on November 19, with the Dean's responses. McKenzie will provide information regarding issues and incidences of non-usual requests for granting credit. That information will help the subcommittee see what is happening and how often such requests for credit occur. Selvage asked that the subcommittee also meet with a Curriculum Council faculty representative before their next meeting with the Dean of the College of Technology. Enos said the subcommittee reviewed the memo from Curriculum Council and will bear the specific concerns in mind as they work on this issue of granting academic and/or technical credits.

2) **Admissions Requirements subcommittee**

Ford had reported the committee would meet the next morning. More information would be forthcoming after that meeting.

3. **New Business**

a. New Charges from Faculty Senate

1) Priority Registrations: I

Selvage said that during the last Advisory Council meeting the topic of priority registration for athletes, Honors students, new freshmen and other groups was brought up. It was seen as a possible retention tool. There was some question whether priority registration would be under the purview of the Academic Standards Council or some other entity. Germino did not think that it was in the purview of this Council and that the issue should be deferred to Faculty Senate.

4. **Adjournment:** 4:33 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday, November 19, 2008 at 3:00 p.m.** in the Faculty Senate conference room.

Respectfully submitted,

Lindsay Allen
Recording Secretary
College of Technology

Catherine Wallace
Administrative Assistant 1
Faculty Senate Office

Approved by Academic Standards Council: April 15, 2009

Accepted by Faculty Senate: April 20, 2009