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

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Wade moved to adopt the agenda subject to moving New Business ahead of Old Business and adding the incomplete issue to Old Business. D. Brouillette seconded. Motion carried.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Approval of Minutes (2/8/12)

D. Wade stated that there was an attachment to the minutes indicating what was referred back to the College of Education.

D. Wade moved to approve the amended minutes for 2/8/12, seconded by D. Brouillette. Motion carried.

B. Report from the Advising Deans

J. Boersma stated that the advising deans heard wonderful information from Scott Peska who works for the Military Student Services Office which supports veterans on our
campus. Also, she stated they received wonderful information from the new director of the Honors Program on various new initiatives.

III. New Business

A. Renewal of Limited Retention Requests – College of Business
   1. Accountancy
   2. Finance
   3. Management and Business Administration Majors
   4. Marketing
   5. Operations Management and Information Systems

D. Wade stated that limited retention programs have to be renewed periodically. E. Seaver decided that these should be done when the program review was done.

D. Wade moved to approve the College of Business’ renewal of limited retention requests as a packet. D. Brouillette seconded, and limited retention programs were opened for discussion.

D. Ballantine asked how one examines the effect of limited retention.

D. Wade stated that the APPM does not mention under-represented groups. It just mentions the adverse effect on students. He stated that if APASC wanted to re-visit the limited retention/limited admission language it could be done.

D. Ballantine suggested that the wording be modified to say if there are students that fall into these under-represented or socio-economic backgrounds they identify those at the time of transcript review and point them in the direction of additional resources both within the College of Business and Access.

S. Eaton stated that it was not necessary to mention minorities or under-represented groups, but state that students not meeting retention standards have the following options of support.

J. Wolfskill moved to call the question. D. Wade seconded.

The question is to approve the motion to refer the Renewal of Limited Retention programs, other than Accountancy, back to the College of Business to address the impact of “C” or better in UBUS 310 on under-represented students and if they find an adverse impact, what efforts/resources are they making to assist these students. Motion carried.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. Incompletes

J. Boersma stated that the incomplete language in the 2011-2012 undergraduate catalog presently states that there are 200 days in which a student can resolve an incomplete. The advising deans and many of the faculty would like to change this to 120 days.
J. Boersma stated the Advising Deans have four rationale for this change which is taken from the point of view of the current 200 day policy.

1. With the 200 day policy a student can cycle through two dismissal reviews before the college is asked to review them.
2. 200 days is too long of a period for most faculty members.
3. 200 days is too long a period of time for many students.
4. The professor always owns the grade. Whether the incomplete lapses to a grade of “F” at 200 or 120 days each professor can continue to work with the student if they so choose. The communication between the student and the faculty member is maintained. The student can continue to complete their work even if it is changed from 200 to 120 days, because the professor always owns the grade.

J. Boersma stated that 120 days only goes through one dismissal review and is a more reasonable amount of time for the faculty and students.

A. Birberick said something about APASC requesting a written rationale and J. Boersma turned in her hand written rationale with the four points mentioned. A. Birberick also reiterated the fact that the professor owns the grade and even if the “I” becomes an “F” the professor can change the grade with no adverse effect. At the time a professor assigns an incomplete, they are to also fill out a form indicating what work is missing and what needs to be done to resolve the incomplete. So there is a record of what needs to be done even if a student has passed the deadline and received an “F”.

L. Smart moved to approve the change of the amount of time to resolve an incomplete from 200 days to 120 days. D. Zinger seconded. Motion passed.

B. Plus/Minus Grading

D. Wade stated that he took J. Wolfskill’s place with E. Klonoski on the subcommittee for plus/minus grading with Charles Kappell and Stephen Martin from the Faculty Senate.

Last year this went up to the UCC and the UCC encouraged APASC to work together to find a resolution to this issue. The Faculty Senate’s position is plus/minus only.

E. Klonoski stated that the Faculty Senate’s argument is that no faculty member is obliged to issue the plus or minus, but the ones that wish to use it would now have the latitude to do so.

D. Wade said that this would have an impact on repeat grading.

A. Birberick asked how this would affect the “C” or better requirement for teacher certification. D. Wade indicated that the state will not accept a grade of “C-” and the course would have to be retaken.
E. Klonoski said that a department can choose to maintain or alter their existing “C” or better minimum policies outside of teacher’s certification.

E. Klonoski asked what justification the Faculty Senate had to persuade us to change to plus/minus grading.

D. Wade stated that with the exception of Illinois colleges the plus/minus grading is a very common system. They did a survey of Big 10, MAC and Illinois schools. University of Illinois at Champaign and now Western Illinois University have adopted the plus/minus system.

E. Klonoski stated that the Faculty Senate’s argument is that they wish to refine the differentiation among grade categories.

D. Wade said that APASC’s role is to make a decision on the grading scale. APASC has two choices which are to either adopt a system other than our current system – plus/minus, plus only or half step OR to do nothing and retain the current grading system. If APASC makes the later decision, there is really nothing the UCC can do other than send it back to APASC for us to re-vote.

E. Klonoski said that the Faculty Senate was offered the opportunity to address APASC and they plan to present their case at our April 4th meeting.

D. Wade said that he encouraged the Faculty Senate to do a representative faculty survey before our next meeting. If they want to persuade APASC that this is overwhelmingly supported by the faculty, then they should do a good study and prove it.

J. Wolfskill stated that even if there was 100% faculty support, there would need to be an overwhelming support for administrative remedies for all of the problems the plus/minus grading would create.

D. Wade indicated that he feels the plus system appears friendlier. This system provides the opportunity for the good students to be recognized without “appearing” to punish the low end of the scale. He said it could be a plus that a student could get a 3.5, 2.5 or 1.5 here at NIU that they could not get at ISU.

E. Klonoski stated that with the plus/minus a “C-” is now in the range of what once was a “D”. Historically a “C” represented “satisfactory” level. Now we have a “C” that is satisfactory for teacher certification and many other courses, but a “C-” retains the “C”ness but is unsatisfactory and repeatable like a “D”.

D. Wade stated again that the Faculty Senate will be at our April 4th meeting to present their position on the plus/minus grading system.
V. ADJOURNMENT

Minutes submitted by Lisa Allison.