OPENING: The meeting was called to order by D. Wade.

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

It was moved by D. Wade, seconded by P. Hartman to adopt the agenda. Motion passed.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Approval of Minutes (11/10/10)

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

B. Report from Advising Deans
III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Academic Integrity Language

There were two walk-ins brought in. They were the “Procedures for Appealing Allegedly Capricious Semester Grades of Undergraduate Students” and “Misconduct Policy Language”.

D. Wade stated that APASC passed a policy that was forwarded from the Faculty Senate regarding academic misconduct at the May 5, 2010 APASC meeting. This was then forwarded to the UCC and they deleted the sentence “In cases where the student feels the penalty is inappropriate, an appeal of the penalty only, may be made to the college council.”

The AdHoc committee agreed that the appellate process was not the problem but rather the appeal to the college council. It was decided to take this to the department level rather than the college level and use the grade appeal process. The problem is that the grade appeal process only talks about capricious grading. That required a modification of the APPM dealing with capricious grading.

D. Wade indicated that the changes to the APPM reflect that it is now doing two things rather than one. He also suggested approving these both as a unit.

M. Pritchard stated that the Advising Deans have looked at this and have no concerns. She also stated that this proposal preserves faculty authority over grades, but also protects the right for students to appeal.

J. Wolfskill noted that the Judicial Office has been renamed to “Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct”. This needs to be updated to the correct name in both the APPM and the Misconduct Policy Language.

D. Wade said that the full title is “Procedures for Appealing Allegedly Capricious Semester Grades and/or Grade Penalties for Violations of Academic Integrity of Undergraduate Students. Also, the additional text in the introduction of the procedures will read as follows:

The following procedures are available only for review of allegedly capricious grading or a grade penalty imposed for violating standards of academic integrity.

D. Wade moved to approve the Misconduct Policy Language and the Procedures for Appealing Allegedly Capricious Semester Grades and/or Grade Penalties for Violations of Academic Integrity of Undergraduate Students as amended. M. Pritchard seconded. Motion carried.
IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Curricular Items Referred from CUC

- COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES, Curriculum Committee Meeting #6, 10/20, 2010 – See attachment #3

Certificate in Public Sector Leadership

D. Wade stated that all other certificate programs require a “C” or better and this certificate program states a requirement of a 3.0 GPA and there was no rationale.

K. Thurmaier stated that the College Curriculum Committee thought the 3.0 was a good idea and Dean Doederlein (LA&S) also supported the 3.0 GPA. He also stated that the GIS program in Geography has a 3.0 GPA minimum so this would not be the only certificate program with a 3.0 GPA minimum requirement.

K. Thurmaier stated that the Public Administration program’s mission is its focus on excellence in public service. He stated that NIU’s program is one of the most rigorous programs in the country. It is ranked #3 in local government management in the U.S. It is one of the last programs that requires a comprehensive exam and a capstone paper. In order to take the comprehensive exam in the MPA, a student must have over a 3.0 GPA. People who work in the public sectors are the focus of this program.

K. Thurmaier stated that half of the students in the MPA are pre-career students coming out of an undergraduate program in public service. The other half are mid-career professionals that are returning for a master’s degree.

K. Thurmaier stated that the Certificate in Public Sector Leadership is an undergraduate certificate not a graduate certificate. He stated that there is a demand for mid-career professionals working in various government offices that have not completed an undergraduate degree, but see the need of an undergraduate degree to move into a higher position.

K. Thurmaier stated that the audience of mid-career professionals is used to meeting standards. He stated that when you set the bar, people need to meet the bar. He also stated that the department is not interested in mediocre public servants. If a student cannot get at least a “B” average in four courses in the program, then there is the question whether the Division of Public Administration is meeting their mission of promoting excellence in public service.
K. Thurmaier stated that since the Public Administration program is an accredited program they are required to measure learning outcomes and have to show they are achieving their mission. However, this accreditation only applies to the masters in Public Administration.

The hope is to entice students into a full undergraduate degree at NIU by getting them into this certificate program. These courses are offered at Harper, Oakton and other locations.

K. Thurmaier said that the Public Administration program is a competency based, curriculum controlled oriented program. They are very sure about what kind of competency they expect from their students graduate or undergraduate.

D. Wade stated that APASC needs to see evidence that options of other standards were considered and why the 3.0 GPA was chosen. Also, what is the impact of the 3.0 GPA on less advantaged students? This needs to be considered.

J. Wolfskill moved to refer the Certificate in Public Sector Leadership back to the Department of Political Sciences for rationale regarding the requirement of the 3.0 GPA. D. Wade seconded. Motion carried.

B. Removal of Dual Admission from Undergraduate Catalog

D. Wade moved to remove the Dual Admission language from the undergraduate catalog. Motion carried.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Minutes submitted by Lisa Allison.
Attachment for APASC minutes #167 – December 8, 2010 -- #1

Misconduct Policy Language
(Initial revisions approved by APASC 05/05/10)
(Additional revision approved by UCC 05/06/10)

PROPOSED Revision Recommended by APASC/UCC Ad Hoc Committee
December 8, 2010 (Highlighted in yellow)

Old

A faculty member has original jurisdiction over any instances of academic misconduct that occur in a course which the faculty member is teaching. The student shall be given the opportunity to resolve the matter in meetings with the faculty member and the department chair. If the facts of the incident are not disputed by the student, the faculty member may elect to resolve the matter at that level by levying a sanction no greater than an F for that course. The faculty member shall notify the student in writing whenever such action is taken, and the University Judicial Office shall receive a copy of the Academic Misconduct Incident Report indicating final disposition of the case, which will be placed in the student’s judicial file. In all matters where the charge of academic misconduct is disputed by the student or if the faculty member feels a sanction greater than an F in the course is appropriate (such as repeated offenses or flagrant violations), the faculty member shall refer the matter to the University Judicial Office making use of the Academic Misconduct Incident Report. Additional sanctions greater than an F in a course can be levied only through the University Judicial System.

New

“A faculty member has original jurisdiction over any instances of academic misconduct that occur in a course which the faculty member is teaching. The student shall be given the opportunity to resolve the matter in meetings with the faculty member and the department chair. If the facts of the incident are not disputed by the student, the faculty member may elect to resolve the matter at that level by levying a sanction no greater than an F for that course. The faculty member shall notify the student in writing whenever such action is taken, and the University Judicial Office Office of Community Standards & Student Conduct shall receive a copy of the Academic Misconduct Incident Report indicating final disposition of the case, which will be placed in the student’s judicial file. In all matters where the charge of academic misconduct is disputed by the student or if the faculty member feels a sanction greater than an F in the course is appropriate (such as repeated offenses or flagrant violations), the faculty member shall refer the matter to the University Judicial Office Office of Community Standards & Student Conduct making use of the Academic Misconduct Incident Report. Additional sanctions greater than an F in a course can be levied only through the University Judicial System.”

With regards to finding the student either responsible or not responding responsible for his or her action, the ruling of the Judicial Hearing Board shall be binding. In cases where there is either a finding of responsibility or an admission of responsibility by the student, any recommendations by the hearing board regarding the course grade are non-binding on the instructor, who remains solely responsible for assigning a course grade, consistent with the policies set forth in the course syllabus. In cases where the student feels the penalty is inappropriate, an appeal of the penalty only, may be made to the college council. In cases where the student feels the penalty of less than or equal to an F in the course is excessive and/or inappropriate, an appeal of the penalty only may be made through the grade appeal process.
Procedures for Appealing Allegedly Capricious Semester Grades and/or Grade Penalties for Violations of Academic Integrity of Undergraduate Students

Section III. Item 7.

Introduction

The following procedures are available only for review of allegedly capricious grading or a grade penalty imposed for violating standards of academic integrity. The following procedures are not for review of the judgment of an instructor in assessing the quality of a student’s work, or whether the student did or did not violate the instructor’s standards of academic integrity.

Capricious grading, as that term is used herein, is limited to one or more of the following:

- the assignment of a grade to a particular undergraduate student on some basis other than performance in the course;
- the assignment of a grade to a particular undergraduate student by more exacting or demanding standards than were applied to other undergraduate students in that section;
- the assignment of a grade by a substantial departure from the instructor’s criteria distributed in writing during the first fourth of a course.

The assessment of the quality and integrity of a student’s academic performance is one of the major professional responsibilities of university faculty members and is solely and properly their responsibility. It is essential for the standards of the academic programs at Northern Illinois University and the integrity of the degrees conferred by this university that the professional judgments of faculty members not be subject to pressures or other interference from any source. In order to assure the equitable assessment of a student’s academic performance, faculty are to maintain grading materials in accordance with Section III, Item 5,F.

Materials regarding violations of academic integrity will be maintained by the Office of Judicial Affairs Community Standards & Student Conduct.

The Right of Fair and Equal Evaluation of Students

A course grade must be based on evidence of the student’s performance, the student must have access to the evidence, the instructor must explain and interpret the evidence to the student, and a single evaluative standard must be applied to all undergraduate students in a course section. It is also expected that grades and penalties for violations of academic integrity be determined in accordance with written guidelines that should be distributed in each class within the first fourth of the course.

At any time, a student may seek the counsel of the university ombudsman regarding procedure in appealing allegedly capricious grades or the merits of a particular case.

Appeal Procedures

A student who believes a final course grade is capricious or the grade penalty imposed for a violation of academic integrity is excessive and/or inappropriate may seek clarification and,
where appropriate, redress as follows:

One: The student shall confer with the instructor, informing the instructor of questions concerning the grade and/or grade penalty, and seeking to understand fully the grounds and procedures the instructor has used in determining the grade and/or grade penalty. The aim of such a conference is to reach mutual understanding about the grade and/or grade penalty and the process by which it was assigned, and to correct errors, if any, in the grade and/or grade penalty.

If, for any reason, the instructor cannot be contacted by or fails to respond to the student, the department chair shall designate a faculty member to act for the instructor.

Two: If after consultation with the instructor or the designee, the student believes that a grade is capricious and/or the grade penalty is excessive and/or inappropriate, the student shall confer with the chair of the department in which the course is offered, who shall consult and advise with both the instructor and student, separately or together, in an effort to reach an understanding and resolution of the matter.

Three: If Steps One and Two do not resolve the problem, the student may submit a petition in writing to the Grade Review Board in the academic department in which the course in question was offered. This petition must be submitted through the department chair not later than the end of the fourth week of the semester following the semester or summer term for which the grade was assigned and/or grade penalty imposed, as announced in the schedule of classes. (Petitions regarding spring grades must be submitted no later than the end of the fourth week of the fall semester but may be permitted during summer session.) If a temporary grade was assigned initially, the petition to appeal a grade must be submitted no later than four weeks following the Registrar notification to the student that the final grade has been assigned.

The petition shall request a meeting with the Grade Review Board and shall present evidence allegedly proving that the grade is capricious as defined above, or the grade penalty is excessive and/or inappropriate, and it shall present the student's conclusions and the arguments which substantiate those conclusions. The Grade Review Board shall refer the petition to the instructor and secure from him or her a response in writing, setting forth the instructor's position on the matter. The Grade Review Board shall provide the student with a copy of the instructor's response.

The Grade Review Board shall make every reasonable effort to conduct an inquiry within two weeks of receipt of the petition to ascertain and consider relevant facts. The inquiry will be based on a consideration of the student's petition, the instructor's response, and any interviews by the chair of the Grade Review Board with the student or the instructor. The Grade Review Board shall convene a meeting with the student should the latter ask for one, and may initiate a meeting with the student, with the instructor, or with both.

If, for any reason, the instructor cannot be contacted by or fails to respond to the student, the department chair shall designate a faculty member to act for the instructor.
The Grade Review Board shall make one of these decisions:

a. That the grade was not assigned capriciously and shall stand as assigned.
b. That the grade may have been assigned capriciously and merits further consideration.
c. That the grade penalty was not excessive or inappropriate and shall stand as imposed.
d. That the grade penalty was excessive and/or inappropriate and merits further consideration

If conclusion "b" or "d" is reached, the Grade Review Board may then arrange for the instructor or a group of two departmental colleagues (these may be the faculty members of the Grade Review Board) to re-examine all the evidence of the student's work. (If there is not enough evidence, an additional examination may be conducted or additional work assigned to help determine the student's level of mastery and achievement in the subject matter.)

The Grade Review Board shall, as a result of its consideration, recommend a grade and/or penalty the same as or different from the grade alleged to be capricious.

The Grade Review Board shall immediately notify the department chair and dean of the college in which the academic department is housed of its decision.

Four: The dean shall notify the student and the instructor of the Grade Review Board's decision and review the case. If the decision of the Grade Review Board is that the grade and/or grade penalty should be changed, the dean shall consult with the instructor if requested by the instructor; if the decision of the Grade Review Board is that the grade and/or grade penalty should stand, the dean shall consult with the student if requested by the student. The dean may consult both the instructor and the student, either individually or collectively. On the basis of the review, and the meeting with the instructor and/or student, the dean (a) may concur with the decision of the Grade Review Board and, as appropriate, direct the instructor to make the grade and/or grade penalty change or notify the instructor that the original grade and/or grade penalty stands; either of these decisions shall be final, or (b) may request the Grade Review Board to reconsider its decision. After a reconsideration by the Grade Review Board, its recommendation regarding the student's course grade and/or grade penalty is final. Should the reconsideration of the Grade Review Board involve a change in grade and/or grade penalty, the dean shall direct the instructor to make the grade and/or grade penalty change. In the event the instructor declines to make the grade and/or grade penalty change, the dean shall authorize the Registrar to make the grade and/or grade penalty change and such a decision shall be final.

Note: At the conclusion of each step, the student, the instructor, and the department chair shall be notified promptly and no later than one week after each decision has been reached.

Composition of Departmental Grade Review Board

Each academic department shall establish early in each academic year a Grade Appeals Panel to be available to consider appeals from students alleging that they have received capricious course grades and/or excessive/inappropriate grade penalties for violating standards of academic integrity.

The Panel shall consist of four tenured faculty members, excluding the department chair, and
four undergraduate students from the department. In a department with fewer than four tenured faculty members, the dean may appoint other tenured faculty members from the college to the Panel. The four student members of the Panel shall be selected by the appropriate departmental student advisory board. (If there is no department student advisory board, the students shall be selected by the college student advisory board.) Prior to the initial meeting of the Grade Review Board, the student and the instructor involved in the grade appeal each has the right to exclude one member from the Panel from which the Grade Review Board will be selected.

The Grade Review Board for hearing an undergraduate student's appeal shall consist of two faculty and one undergraduate student. The members will be selected by lot from those faculty and student Panel members remaining after any members of the Panel have been excluded at the request of either the student or the instructor involved in the appeal. Neither the student nor the instructor involved in an appeal may be a member of the Grade Review Board reviewing that specific appeal.

NOTE: If the course under consideration is administered by a unit other than an academic department e.g., a college or an interdisciplinary center), the "department chair" in this document is understood to mean the administrative head of that unit, and the Grade Appeals Panel and Grade Review Board will be composed of faculty and students affiliated with that unit.

Protection of the Instructor’s Rights

No decision of a Grade Review Board shall, by itself, be used as a cause for dismissal of a tenured faculty member or for dismissal of a non-tenured faculty member before the expiration of a contract period. Nor shall a decision, by itself, be a basis for any other disciplinary action. Any disciplinary actions shall be in accordance with regular university procedures. All evidence considered by a Grade Review Board shall be made available to any body that may be considering disciplinary action concerning an instructor whose grading has been found by a Grade Review Board to be capricious or whose grade penalties have been found to be excessive or inappropriate. That body shall make an independent determination based upon its own consideration of all evidence, irrespective of the findings of the Grade Review Board.

Approved by the University Council December 11, 1974;

Reviewed and Amended by the University Council: April 14, 1976; April 28, 1982; February 11, 1987; April 13, 1988; April 6, 1994; April 10, 1996; January 26, 2000; April 12, 2000;

Editorial correction July 2, 2002; July 13, 2010

Last Updated: July 13, 2010
Certificate in Public Sector Leadership (12)
The certificate prepares students to take on effective leadership roles within public service organizations and situations. Leadership skill and knowledge is fundamental for individuals contemplating or currently pursuing career positions with public service organizations such as government units and nonprofit organizations. Knowing how to frame a vision, how to think strategically, how to solve problems, how to motivate employees, and how to adapt an organization to complex environmental change is all part of being a public service leader.

The certificate is open to all NIU undergraduates. Students must maintain good academic standing in the university, achieve a minimum grade of C in each certificate course, achieve a GPA of at least 3.00 in all certificate courses, and complete all certificate course work within six calendar years. All course requirements for the certificate must be completed at NIU. Some of the courses may, with the approval of the major department, be applied toward an undergraduate major. The Division of Public Administration reserves the right to limit enrollment in any of the certificate courses.

Requirements
PSPA 201 (3) Public Service Leadership
PSPA 331x (3) Introduction to Public Administration

and two of the following
PSPA 302X (3) Government in Metropolitan Areas
PSPA 303X (3) State and Local Government
PSPA 330X (3) Bureaucracy and the Public Policy Process
PSPA 327x (3) Electronic Governance
PSPA 410 (1) Supervision in the Public Sector
PSPA 411 (3) The Ethical Public Administrator
PSPA 412 (3) Public Budgeting
PSPA 413 (1) Community Engagement in Public Safety Agencies
PSPA 395 (3) Contemporary Topics in Public Service (can repeat for 6 credit max)

Rationale: The mission of the Division of Public Administration is to advance excellence in professional public management through scholarship in teaching, research, and service. The division is committed to strengthening the knowledge and skills that enhance the management and leadership capacity of individuals pursuing public service careers.

The undergraduate Certificate in Public Sector Leadership (CPCL) is targeted at an audience of mid-career public sector professionals who hold positions in public sector departments, especially in local governments. These individuals work as water treatment plant crews, road crews, housing inspectors, and so on. They are lower level supervisors, and they do not have an undergraduate
degree that will allow them to advance to higher level supervisory positions. They may hold a 2 year community college associate degree in a technical field, such as water sanitation, and so on. The certificate is an opportunity to let these individuals experience a regular college undergraduate curriculum, and one that specifically will enhance their leadership skills in their public sector specialization.

The division faculty was approached over a year ago by the Illinois Public Service Institute, an annual week-long training conference of public works officials from around the state. They would like to partner with NIU’s public administration (PA) faculty to enhance the educational opportunities for the public works officials. From a series of discussions of the interested parties, we have developed the CPSL as a first step in offering university-level educational opportunities for IPSI members. As the PA faculty considered the certificate idea, we also designed it to be broad enough to serve other mid-career public workers who desire undergraduate credits, and to insure the courses in the CPSL count toward present or future undergraduate degrees at NIU.

The changes to the CPSL from the earlier submission (8 Sep 2010) reflect subsequent discussions with Dr. Hermanson, Director of the NGOLD Center. It is our collective assessment that we do not anticipate much demand for the certificate among nonprofit managers, since most have some type of undergraduate degree already and they are a target audience for the MPA or the Graduate Certificate in Public Management. Thus, we are narrowing the scope of the CPSL to the public sector (instead of the earlier “public service” scope). Second, to avoid any confusion with the new Community Leadership and Civic Engagement (CLCE) degree, we have deleted the nonprofit management course (PSPA 326x) from the list of electives, consonant with the narrower public sector scope.