NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

ADMISSIONS POLICIES AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE
(APASC)

Minutes of Meeting #164
September 1, 2010

Approved

Present: A. Radasanu (LAS); S. Arnett (HHS); J. Wolfskill (LAS/MATH); P. Hartman (EDUC/TLRN); E. Klonoski (VPA); D. Zinger (EET/TECH); M. Pritchard (Council of Adv. Deans); B. Goldenberg (UCC)

Ex Officio: S. Eaton (EDUC SERV & PROG); E. Seaver (VICE PROVOST); B. Hemphill (STUDENT AFFAIRS)

Students: A. Warren (HHS/Public Health)

Absent: D. Wade (BUS/MGMT); M. Gillis (TRANSFER CENTER); B. Lagana (ADMISSIONS)

Visitors: L. Allison (REGISTRATION AND RECORDS); S. Warber (REGISTRATION AND RECORDS); D. Smith (CATALOG/CURRICULUM COORDINATOR)

OPENING: The meeting was called to order by E. Seaver.

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

It was moved by D. Zinger, seconded by M. Pritchard to adopt the agenda. Motion passed.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Introductions

B. Approval of Minutes (05/05/10)

It was moved by D. Zinger, seconded by M. Pritchard to approve the minutes. Motion carried.

C. Report from the Advising Deans

There was no report from the Advising Deans.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Academic Integrity Language

E. Seaver stated that in May the Academic Integrity Language was walked into the UCC meeting because they wanted to get this new language into the catalog
and resolve a language conflict between the undergraduate catalog and the code of conduct. UCC removed the last sentence “In cases where the student feels the penalty is inappropriate, an appeal of the penalty only, may be made to the college council”. This language went into the 2010-2011 undergraduate catalog.

E. Klonoski asked if the Judicial Board is different than the Judicial Office. B. Hemphill stated that now the University Judicial Office is the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct and that the Judicial Hearing Board is a board made up of faculty and students.

E. Seaver indicated that he felt there were two issues with the last sentence. The first issue was students have no recourse. The second was whether or not the college council is the appropriate place for appeals.

E. Seaver asked if there were any suggestions on a resolution. M. Pritchard asked if they wanted to amend the APASC minutes and also take the last sentence out.

E. Seaver said that if APASC leaves it as it is and UCC chooses not to change, then this will have to be resolved by the University Council. He stated that this language was not unanimously approved by the Faculty Senate, but by the majority. This language is in the Code of Student Conduct. He also indicated that since the College Council is probably an inappropriate place for this appeal it may be good for this to be decided by University Council.

J. Wolfskill asked if the term “penalty” used in the last sentence was to be a grade penalty or some other sanction or both. B. Hemphill said it was to be the grade.

J. Wolfskill suggested to amend the language so it is clear that it is a grade penalty only and that can be appealed. Also, that the appeal be made to the dean of the college or the dean’s designee.

E. Seaver stated that the grade appeal process is run by the faculty. The only time administration is involved is when a recommendation goes to the dean.

J. Wolfskill stated that the problem is that the standard grade appeal process only addresses problems of “capricious” grading. Meaning that one student is being treated differently than others in the class. So what would seem to be an arbitrary or unfair policy if enforced uniformly would not fall under a grade appeal. The student would have no recourse.

E. Seaver said that as this relates to the academic integrity the student has no appeal if they think the penalty was too harsh or unfair.

B. Hemphill said that the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct wanted the Judicial Board to make a determination, but the final decision of the grade goes back to the college.

M. Pritchard asked if the college could have a designee for these appeals which would be consistent with the way other things are handled. She said that then the college could decide if it needed to be forwarded on to the college council.
B. Hemphill liked this suggestion of the appeal going to the dean or dean’s designee.

E. Klonoski asked what the point of the board’s recommendation was if the board’s finding was not binding in any way.

B. Hemphill stated that the Judicial Board’s recommendations are binding all but the grade. The Judicial Board could decide to suspend or put the student on probation.

E. Seaver said that APASC could ask a group to develop language that would be more specific as it relates to the appeal process in terms of any kind of sanctions that seem too serious. He suggested that M. Pritchard take this back to the Advising Deans.

B. Grade “C” Policy from Department of Teaching and Learning

LTIC 301, LTIC 420 and LTLA 301 were added to the special requirements for a major in elementary education which are professional courses. The students are required to earn a “C” or better in all professional courses.

E. Seaver stated that a student cannot be certified by the state of Illinois as of February 2012 with a grade lower than “C” in their professional courses.

J. Wolfskill moved to accept the proposal from Teaching and Learning, M. Pritchard seconded. Motion carried.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Acceptance of APASC Annual Report 2009-2010

D. Zinger moved to accept the APASC Annual Report 2009-2010, E. Klonoski seconded. Motion carried.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Minutes submitted by Lisa Allison.