

Special Meeting  
**UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**04/22/13 (3:31 p.m. – 5:01 p.m.)**  
**Mtg. #1734**

SUMMARY MINUTES

**Summary of main points**

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Peters** called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

No members of the press were present.

Provost **Gibson** had no comments today.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** had no comments today.

Chair **Peters** opened his comments by recognizing the newly-elected NISG officers present: Todd **Madsen** (President), Blake **Findley** (Vice-President), and Steph **McGraw** (Speaker of the Senate). Blake will attend Faculty Senate meetings regularly, and the others were welcomed to attend whenever they wished.

Chair **Peters** then introduced the newly-elected University Faculty Senate members, who came today to participate in the election of a new Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect and whose 3-year terms will officially begin May 15, 2013: Barbara **Cutter** (CSBS, History), Todd **Evans** (COE, HPELS), Gretchen **Gould** (Library), and Steve **O’Kane** (CHAS, Biology). Lauren **Nelson** (CHAS, Communication Sciences and Disorders) will also begin a 3-year term next month.

Chair **Peters** continued his recognitions by congratulating current Senators Forrest **Dolgener** and Laura **Terlip**, both re-elected for a second 3-year term. And he extended his thanks to the Committee on Committees and to

all the College Senates for their work to hold timely elections so that the new Senators could come today and participate in the election.

Following, Chair **Peters** belatedly recognized last year's outgoing Senators, giving each a certificate suitable for framing and offering the sincere thanks of the entire faculty for their service: Katherine **Van Wormer**, Michael **Roth** (who has since left UNI and was contacted via email), Susan **Wurtz** (who served as Chair for 3 of her 6 years), and Jeffrey **Funderburk** (who served as Chair last year).

And finally, Chair **Peters** recognized with certificates the current Senators who are ending their service to the Faculty Senate following the next meeting, extending sincere thanks from all faculty for their service: Greg **Bruess**, Betty **DeBerg**, Phil **East**, Deb **Gallagher**, and Chris **Neuhaus**.

To finish his comments, Chair **Peters** noted that there will be a special meeting next Monday, April 29<sup>th</sup>, to finish up the year's business. It will be held here in the Oak Room at 3:30, as usual, and he will get an Agenda out as soon as possible tomorrow.

## 2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

April 1, 2013, Minutes were approved as submitted without objection.

April 8, 2013, Minutes were approved as submitted without objection.

## 3. Docketed from the Calendar

**1192 1088** Request for Emeritus Status – Richard Allen Hays, Jr., regular order

\*\*Motion to docket in regular order (**Kirmani/Bruess**). Passed.

## 4. New Business

None

## 5. Consideration of Docketed Items

### **1190 1086** Election of Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect (head of docket Apr 22)

\*\*Motion to move into Executive Session.

\*\*Election held by ballot between Senator **Kidd** and Senator **Terlip**.

\*\*Senator **Kidd**, 9 votes. Senator **Terlip**, 8 votes.

\*\*Senator **Kidd** will serve as next year's Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect.

### **1137 1033** Policy Regarding Faculty Notification of Grade Changes— Report from EPC (**MacLin/Kidd**)

\*\*EPC Report constituted the motion itself.

\*\*Motion to amend section 4A (**DeBerg/Walter**).

\*\*Motion withdrawn following lengthy discussion.

\*\*Motion to return Report back to EPC (**Heston/Terlip**).

\*\*After lengthy discussion and without objection, petition returned to Educational Policies Commission for further consideration with Faculty Senate input

### **1191 1087** Creation of faculty committees and procedures to implement Master Agreement due process standards for dismissal of faculty (regular order) (**MacLin/Kidd**)

\*\*Will be considered at special meeting on April 29, 2013

### **1183 1079** Recommendations of ad hoc Committee on Curriculum Review—Final recommendations (regular order) (**MacLin/Kidd**)

\*\*Will be considered at special meeting on April 29, 2013

## 5. Adjournment

Meeting declared adjourned, without objection, at 5:01 p.m. by Chair **Peters**.

Next meeting:

04/29/13

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 52 pages, including 1 Addendum.

Regular Meeting  
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE  
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
April 08, 2013  
Mtg. 1733**

**PRESENT:** Melinda **Boyd**, Gregory **Bruess**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Betty **DeBerg**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Chris **Edginton**, Blake **Findley**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Deborah **Gallagher**, Gloria **Gibson**, David **Hakes**, Melissa **Heston**, Rob **Hitlan** (substituting for Kim **MacLin**), Tim **Kidd**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Jerry **Smith**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, Michael **Walter**

**ALSO PRESENT:** Newly-elected Senators  
Barbara **Cutter**, Todd **Evans**, Gretchen **Gould**, and Steve **O’Kane**

**Absent:** Karen **Breitbach**, Marilyn **Shaw**, Gary **Shontz**, Mitchell **Strauss**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Peters:** Ok. Let’s go ahead and come to order.

**COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

**Peters:** Are there any members of the press present? I see none.

**COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON**

**Peters:** Provost **Gibson** is in a meeting that’s going long, it sounds like, so if she has any comments, we’ll circle back around and get her.

## COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

**Peters:** Chair **Funderburk**, any comments for us?

**Funderburk:** I have no comments today.

**Peters:** Ok.

## COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR SCOTT PETERS

**Peters:** I have a few things, mostly just recognizing and introducing people today. I'd like to begin by recognizing the new NISG officers. You've already met, of course, Blake **Findley**, who is the Vice-President and will be attending our meetings and serving on several committees, including the Educational Policies Commission. But I would also like to introduce Tom **Madsen**. Tom a Political Science and Economics major, right?

**Madsen:** Yes.

**Peters:** And is the new NISG President as of, what, a week ago?

**Madsen:** Monday, actually. We were sworn in on two Wednesday's ago, and then took office on that \_\_\_\_\_.

**Peters:** So, and then at his left is Steph **McGraw**, and, Steph, I'm blanking on your major.

**McGraw:** Philosophy and Spanish.

**Peters:** Philosophy and Spanish. I knew it was a double major. Steph was elected the Speaker of the Senate last week. So please join me in welcoming them and thanking them for their service to UNI. [applause all around] And Blake has to come to all our meetings, but you [indicating Tom and Steph] are certainly welcome anytime you would like to come.

And we see some new faces around the table. Our newly-elected Senators will be joining us today to participate in the vote for Vice-Chair. Their full terms begin on May 15<sup>th</sup>. Several of them are joining the Senate for the first time, so I want to introduce them all to you. Many of you probably already know them, but Barbara **Cutter**, who represents CSBS, from the History Department, Todd **Evans**, from the College of Education, in HPELS, Gretchen **Gould** from the Library, Steve **O’Kane**, from CHAS, in Biology. And then is Lauren here? Lauren **Nelson** is also newly-elected, and she comes to us from CHAS, from Communication Sciences and Disorders.

And then congratulations are also due to Forrest **Dolgener** and Laura **Terlip**, who were elected to 2<sup>nd</sup> terms. Special thanks as well to the Committee on Committees and to all of the College Senates who conducted the elections and did it in a timely manner so that we could have everybody here and seated to participate in the election for Vice-Chair.

More recognition, as we talked about a few weeks ago, I would like to recognize our departing Senators, since this is our last regular meeting of the year. Notice there that I stressed the word “regular”—more on that in a moment. But while we’re still all happy, I’d like to [laughter all around] recognize our departing Senators, starting actually with people who left the Senate last year, because we were so busy last Spring and early Fall that we neglected to do it. So, Katherine—I know I saw her walk in. Where did she...? Katherine **Van Wormer** [applause all around as they moved toward each other and he presented her with a certificate for her service]. Katherine, I know this was hardly your first stint on the Senate, but we certainly appreciated it and appreciated all your work. All of these folks, those who departed last year and those who are leaving us now, of course, were on the Senate during some pretty busy times for faculty governance, so we’re especially thankful for all of your service. Mike **Roth**, I did contact via email, but he wasn’t here to join us today. As many of you know, he’s left the University, has gone on to other things, but I think we all remember his service last year and the way he performed during the program closure proposals. Susan **Wurtz**, [applause all around as **Peters** handed her a certificate]. Susan’s certificate doesn’t have a special mark on it for having served as Chair for 3 years, but it probably should, because I can’t imagine doing that job for 3 years. And speaking of Chair, Jeff **Funderburk**

[applause all around as **Peters** handed him a certificate] who served admirably last year as our Chair.

And that brings us to the folks who are winding their time down on the Senate this year [each receiving thanks and a certificate from **Peters** and applause all around with each name spoken]. Greg **Bruess**, Betty **DeBerg**, Phil **East**, Deb **Gallagher**, and Chris **Neuhaus**. So, on behalf of all the faculty, thank you very much for your service on the Senate, but don't get too comfortable, because there's still a little bit of work to do.

We have a full slate of business today, and, as I have hinted at several times, we will have one more meeting next week [Monday, April 29<sup>th</sup>] in order to finish up the year's business. How—what will be on that Agenda depends partly on how far we get on things today. And those of you who were here to be recognized, don't feel obligated to stick around. Tom and Steph, if you don't want to stick around, by all means feel free to take off. So, we'll get an Agenda out for next week's meeting. It will be here at 3:30, our regular time, and I'll get that Agenda out as soon as possible tomorrow.

Any other announcements or any items of business to bring up?

BUSINESS

### MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

**Peters:** Ok, then we move on to Minutes for Approval. We have two Minutes for approval today. Sherry [**Nuss**, transcriptionist], has there been any additions or corrections? [she shook her head] Are there any additions for the April 1<sup>st</sup>—the Minutes for the April 1<sup>st</sup> meeting? Any additions or corrections? Seeing none, we'll consider those approved, if there's no objection. [no objection heard] Any additions or corrections for the April 8<sup>th</sup> meeting? Seeing none. We'll consider those approved, if there's no objection to that. [no objection heard]



## CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Calendar Item 1192 for Docket #1088, Request for Emeritus Status – Richard Allen Hays, Jr.

**Peters:** We have just one item for docketing, an Emeritus Status Request of Al Hays from the Master’s in Public Policy Program. If I could just get a motion to docket that in regular order?

**Male voice:** So move.

**Peters:** Senator **Kirmani** I saw first, and then

**Bruess:** Second.

**Peters:** Senator **Bruess** is a second. Is there any discussion on docketing that? [none heard] All in favor of docketing the Emeritus Status Request for Al Hays in regular order, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No?” [none heard] The motion carries.

## NEW BUSINESS

None.

## CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1190, ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR/CHAIR-ELECT (HEAD OF DOCKET APR 22) (**MacLin/Kidd**)

**Peters:** And that bring us to our consideration of our docketed items. And our first order of business is the election of our new Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect. And so I will recognize Senator **Bruess**, who’s been serving as the Chair of the Nominations Committee.

**Bruess:** Well, the Nominating Committee, which is comprised of all departing Senators, except for those who—the two that were re-elected at the end of their first 3-year term—has received two nominations for that position. One is Senator **Kidd**, Tim **Kidd**, from Physics. And the other one is Senator **Terlip** from Communication Studies. So both of those are the nominations for this particular position of Vice-Chair and Chair-Elect.

**Peters:** Ok. And so you are forwarding both of those on to the Senate then?

**Bruess:** Yes.

**Peters:** So we have two nominees from the Committee. The Bylaws specify that we shall open up the floor for additional nominations. Are there any additional nominations? Seeing none, if there is no objection, we'll close nominations. [no objection heard] Nominations are closed. So, we have a couple of options here. We certainly could proceed immediately to a vote, but if we want to have some discussion—my sense, and I've talked this over with a few people—my sense is that the best thing for us to do probably would be to ask the two nominees to say a few words and then perhaps move into an Executive Session. Ask them to leave. As the non-members of the—ask people who aren't members of the Senate to leave, and we can have our discussion at that point. Is there any objection to proceeding in that way? [no objection heard] Then let's just go ahead and go in alphabetical order, and we'll ask Senator **Kidd** if you have any words of wisdom for us about your nomination, anything to say? I'll turn the floor over to you.

**Kidd:** [a few quiet words covered by squeaky chair first] I've never run for anything in my life before, so this is kind of new. [laughter around] So, maybe to just let you know why I'm interested in doing this. Basically, until last Spring I had no idea what went on at this University outside of my research lab, probably writing grants, papers, supervising students, teaching. That was about it. So, last Spring basically my entire Department was slated to be eliminated, which was a surprise. So, we—me and John **Dise**, another Physics colleague, organized kind of a campaign to get the message out about why the University should not eliminate my

Department. So, we organized a letter-writing campaign, got information out to professional colleagues, alumni, State legislators, Board of Regents, things like that. And I kind of learned a lot about things that went on outside my laboratory which might be important to my personal wellbeing at the University. And we tried to keep the message positive. We tried to do a evidence-based kind of discussion, and I think it worked. I'm not sure, of course, what we did that changed people's minds, or if we did anything at all, but it seemed like we had a large response. We had professional societies write for us; our Dean publically supported us; a noble laureate—I'm not sure how that happened—but we had a lot of people writing letters on our behalf, and since then I've been active in developing curriculum, recruitment in-state, out-of-state, international, and I'd like to take what I've learned in the past year and kind of bring it to a larger scale. That's some of the things. So, I'm kind of surprised that I want to do this, but I really do. [light laughter around]

**Peters:** Thank you, Senator **Kidd**. Senator **Terlip**.

**Terlip:** Well, I sort of hesitate to do this because I've been on lots of committees, and each time I've been in a leadership position in the Senate, we've had a crisis. So [laughter all around], I'm not sure if that's so good. I have a lot of experience, and I think I know faculty governance fairly well on this campus, and I've been a really strong advocate for that. I think we still need to continue to make sure that we get policies and procedures in place so that our voices continue to be heard. So that's really why I'm most interested in doing it. I've been on—I've been here a long time, so I've been on like the Curriculum Committee, and the Awards Committee, the Gen. Ed. Committee, the whatever Committee. I mean, name a committee, and I pretty much know what the functions of most of those are, and like I said, this is the second time I've been on the Senate. A few years ago I did a double stint, as well, and was Vice-Chair twice then. We didn't have the same leadership structure in place. I guess, for me, I would like to do this for a couple of reasons. One is, like I say, to keep the faculty voice out there, but the second is I study communication, and I really think we can do a lot better to communicate with each other as faculty members. That would give me a platform to try some of those things I keep saying we ought to do. So, that's it.

**Peters:** Well, I think what we should do then is have a motion to move into Executive Session with all the current and newly-elected members of the Senate, excluding Senators **Terlip** and **Kidd**. Does that sound appropriate?

**Swan:** So move.

**Peters:** Ok, thank you, Senator **Swan**. Is there a second to that? [joking in the group distracted the proceedings, and no second was heard] We need a two-thirds vote to do that, and I think that it would be appropriate for the Senators who are eligible to vote in the election itself to vote. Ok? So, newly-elected Senators and current Senators. [recording turned off and all non-Senators exited with **Kidd** and **Terlip**]

[Recording back on as everyone filed in and ballots were passed out. Senator **Bruess** volunteered to pick up completed ballots, then he and Senator **Neuhaus** exited to count them. They returned after a brief time, and **Bruess** communicated the results quietly to Chair **Peters** along with handing over the ballots.]

**Peters:** Ok, so we're back. The ballots have been counted, and the results on a 9 to 8 vote are Senator **Kidd**. Congratulations. [applause all around]

DOCKET #1033, POLICY REGARDING FACULTY NOTIFICATION OF GRADE CHANGES—REPORT FROM EPC, REGULAR ORDER (**MacLin/Kidd**)

**Peters:** I think then next up we have the EPC grade changes—administrative grade changes. So, Gayle [**Rhineberger-Dunn**], if you want to join us at the table somewhere. All right, this was a matter that we referred to Committee, and so the Committee's Report constitutes a motion in itself, so I will just recognize you, and we will get started here. [see Addendum 1 for the Report; also can be found on the Faculty Senate petition page under: [administrative\\_grade\\_change\\_policy-april\\_2013.docx](#) or directly at: [http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/petition/administrative\\_grade\\_change\\_policy-april\\_2013.docx](http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/petition/administrative_grade_change_policy-april_2013.docx)]

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Thank you. The request for the EPC [Educational Policies Commission] to create the Administrative Grade Change Policy came out of changes we made to the Grievance Process last year, so it was part of the discussion in the Senate that there be such a policy. And so the EPC undertook that this semester, to create from nowhere an Administrative Grade Change Policy. Our focus in creating the Policy, which we said would be simple and very simplistic with a paragraph—we started with the objective of a paragraph—clearly, that didn't happen—[the Report runs 3 ½ pages]—because it became more complex as we talked about it.

There is a need to protect faculty, the faculty right to assign grades, but the recognition that there are clearly times—no matter how remote, how nonsensical it seems—when faculty will not be available to change grades or are unwilling to change grades. And so our Policy had to become more complex in light of the reality that those things are going to happen. So our Policy is meant to: one, this Policy then, its purpose is to—to create this Policy but still acknowledging that faculty have ownership of their grades and that grades should not be changed by anyone but the faculty unless these circumstances arise.

Something that we also added that we felt was important was a Grievance Process. Too often something happens faculty don't like, and there's no outlet for that except for random complaints throughout the University or on Facebook or your email. So we implemented an appeal of a grade change at the bottom that says, if your grades—if faculty grades are changed without their knowledge, or in circumstances that they feel were not fair, that they have an outlet. And so we've articulated that process on the last couple of pages. I don't want to read the Policy. I think you've all read it. You're all here, so I know you can read, so I will just entertain any questions you have for us, but mostly this is a group—a group that... Working with the EPC has been wonderful. I've been Chair for 2 years. This is my last year as Chair, although I'll still be on the Committee for 2 more years, but we have a wonderful group that very clearly attempts to digest all aspects of the issues that we are required to address. We don't do this lightly. We spend a lot of time doing it, and so clearly we miss things or changes might be needed later. That's what policy is about. It's an

evolving process, but I'm happy to entertain any questions that you might have.

**Peters:** Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** So, first of all, thank you for your work as Chair and your ongoing work on the Committee. I'm concerned about the notification clause which is number II on the first page, Roman Numeral II. I would like there to be a responsible agent in a policy. So, it says the instructor must be notified, but it doesn't say by whom.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** That is

**DeBerg:** And I think unless it's specified who must do the notification, it's impossible to hold anyone accountable it seems.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** I agree, and that should be separate, because—because the Registrar was sitting at our meetings and it automatically defaulted to him, he is working once the Pol—if the Policy is passed, then he will work on exactly how that will work. But it is possible for when those—right now when a grade change needs to be done, you have to fill out the form, and then it goes Department Head and the Dean and to the Registrar's Office. It would come out of the Registrar's Office.

**DeBerg:** Ok, so the

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** So, the second that that SIS system, that once a grade change is made, the email

**DeBerg:** Yeah, well, so it could be put after "email" in that sentence "by the Registrar"? "...anytime there is an alteration"? Do you feel ok about that?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Yeah. That sounds ok. That's where it's going to come from, so that would make sense.

**DeBerg:** Knowing that the Registrar now is many times this faceless, hard-to-use new Student Information System.

**Peters:** Any objection to that? To inserting “by the Registrar” after the words “must be notified” in Roman Numeral IIa? Ok. Seeing none, we’ll make that change. Senator **Kirmani**.

**Kirmani:** Yeah, so the person who made a change would not have to give a rationale for that, for his or her action? I mean, it’s ok, if you are allowing the Administrators to change, but they must state the reason. They should give the rationale to the instructor.

**Peters:** Well, the rest of the Policy spells out the conditions under which a grade could be changed.

**Kirmani:** Well, that’s right. There’s the conditions under which it could be changed, but they should still give their rationale as to why they did do it. Then it would be

**Peters:** Do you—so you mean the notification itself should include.

**Kirmani:** Should include that, yeah.

**Peters:** Ok. I understand. Thoughts on that around the table?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Beyond that, a notification would be just that, a grade change. There was a change of grade. And then I don’t—we’d have to ask the Registrar how much information can come in such an email. I don’t know if it’s one of those electronic ones that just say “A grade change has been submitted,” or if there is something more specific that can be added. But the original grade change form wouldn’t be any different than it is now where you have to say why you are changing a grade.

**Peters:** So, the thought would be then that the professor would be alerted to the change, and then the professor could follow-up to say, “Hey, why was this grade changed?” And it would be the professor’s responsibility to do that, to follow up?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Correct.

**Peters:** Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** That's a little cumbersome, because the professor at the beginning wouldn't know who changed it, wouldn't know to go to the Department Head or the Provost's Office or Dean of Students. I don't know who changes grades. So, that would be one drawback. It would take additional legwork and phone calls on the part of a professor. I guess I don't understand the relationship between this—I think it used to be buff colored—grade change form that we had to get signed off on by a Department Head for a faculty member to change a grade, are we going to continue to use that and it's going to be somehow word processed into the SIS system? Or is that going to become electronic?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** I have no idea if there's any move to make that electronic. That's beyond our Committee.

**DeBerg:** Ok. Ok.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** But we operated under the assumption that that form exists. That is the, according to the Registrar, the only way to change grades, but there is the belief that grades are being changed somehow differently other than with that form.

**DeBerg:** OK.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** So—and so that's why the Policy is so it's—you know, this would alert the faculty that “Hey, a grade was changed,” and “I didn't submit that sheet, so....”

**DeBerg:** Well, do Administrators have to use that form? I know that faculty members do, but do Administrators have to use that form to change grades?

**Peters:** Associate Provost **Licari**.



**Licari:** The—well, the way in which, for example, and I think it's discussed briefly there under III, we would do, for example, a retroactive withdrawal, and that would be by Student Request. So, it's not the Grade Change Form. It's through a different set of paperwork, but, you know, there's a paper trail that is generated as a result

**DeBerg:** Right.

**Licari:** of the student submitting the request and then, for retroactive withdrawals, we require, you know, a lot of documentation of the fact that it's a sensible thing for the student to get. So that, from my perspective, that's the way we would do a grade change, because a retroactive withdrawal is essentially a grade change.

**DeBerg:** Yeah, well, I don't have a problem with the procedural grade changes. We all know about those. I have a prob—the things that few faculty members don't know about are the unusual circumstances.

**Licari:** Well, and I don't know how those arise, but what I do know is that was the impetus behind item number II, the notifications,

**DeBerg:** OK.

**Licari:** so that if you got one of those emails and you didn't fill out the

**DeBerg:** Grade Change Form

**Licari:** the beige Grade Change Form, you would say, "Wait a minute." That's the—that was the impetus there.

**Peters:** Senator **Hitlan**.

**Hitlan:** So, let me see if I'm reading this right. So, any Administrator theoretically can change my grade that I give to a student?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** No, not according to University Policy. There are supposed to be only within special circumstances, like the death of a faculty member, or

**Hitlan:** Or somebody trying to get into Graduate School. Or somebody

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Sure. Those

**Hitlan:** Let's go through them.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Right. This—and this arises because if we just say, “No Administrator can ever change a grade except when a faculty dies,” there’s going to be situations that arise, and there has to be a way to deal with that. And so we asked that a lot of documentation is provided. It’s not just a graduate—we don’t just take the student’s word, when they say, “I can’t get this internship without a grade that says I completed this course. I have to have a completed grade. I can’t get an internship. I can’t apply for a scholarship.” There are places that do that, and so we would theoretically be holding up some of our students from potential career-building opportunities if we don’t have a method for them to sort of appeal the fact that “I’m not getting a grade. I need a grade.” And, granted, I mean, hopefully these circumstances never happen, but we know that they have. We know that there’ll always—even if it’s one time in 10 years, it’s going to happen.

**Hitlan:** So, if the student has a grade, and it’s not the grade that they want to get their internship or to get a honorary or what have you, and they go to an Administrator who sympathizes with them. Technically, they could change their grade without going through any sort of formal processing. Is that what you’re saying, Mike [**Licari**]? Please.

**Licari:** I mean, if a student thought they were graded unfairly or unreasonably or whatever, then they would have to file a

**Hitlan:** Well, then it should go to either Student Grievance or to a—  
technically, it’d, you know, be a faculty committee, according to AAUP  
\_\_\_\_\_ [overlapping talk]

**Licari:** \_\_\_\_\_ if the student thought they were graded unfairly, they would just file a Grievance.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** This is usually—this Policy mostly deals with the assignment of initial grades. So, if a faculty member left to go to—I don't know, pick a country where they don't have easy access to internet—and they forgot to enter a grade and the student can't get an internship or a scholarship without that grade, though—that's what this is about. It's not about

**Hitlan:** It's not limited to that. Everywh—there are a bunch of places I see "grade changes," too, in there. So, I think that's potentially

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Right, because if you don't—an Incomplete, that an Incomplete is an assigned grade. So, if you had an Incomplete and you left because you forgot you have to—a student is working on an Incomplete and then they complete, that would be a grade change not an initial assignment of a grade.

**Hitlan:** Right. Or if a student's gotten a lower grade than they want, and they come in, and, you know, I can think of several different reasons why they may come in and want a different grade, and then they get a sympathetic ear, and the grade's changed, and the only recourse to the faculty member, it seems like, is to, after the grade's changed, to see if there's going to be a committee that—and I still don't really understand how this committee membership was designed in terms of the 3-person Faculty Appeal Committee. It's not consistent with AAUP guidelines, I'll tell you that, to have the Registrar—and then a Registrar—pretty much seems they're Chair of the Committee, based on their responsibilities, and a Registrar in and of him or herself is actually an Admin person. And, I mean, if you look through AAUP policies and suggestions of committee A on academic freedom, it says that you—on any appeal committee should be made up of faculty members. So, I was wondering if you could address that, too?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Sure. We chose the Registrar because at this point we don't know who—at this point you may not know who assigned the grade, so you can't have your Department Head in charge of creating that committee, the Dean, the Provost's Office, because theoretically any Administrator could have changed that grade, so in our discussion, it was picking a neutral party who would have no vested interest in the grade change. So, I mean, the Registrar is so integral to the process that that was why.

**Hitlan:** Your assumption that the Registrar is always going to be neutral

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Yeah, that's our assumption.

**Hitlan:** That's—ok, I think that's a big assumption, just

**Peters:** Senator **Heston**.

**Heston:** I share some concerns in terms of whether or not this provides substantial or sufficient protection for faculty. I do know of a few cases a Department Head has done exactly what Senator **Hitlan** describes, sided with a student when there was a personality conflict. The faculty member didn't know how to address that. It happens. Depends on whether the faculty is tenured or untenured, feels like they can make a fuss, etc. It's rare. I believe it's very, very rare, but I have known it to happen, and sometimes it happens more than once with the same faculty member. You can interpret that how it is. I guess I just found it difficult to kind of follow the steps. I would find it much more helpful if there were a, like, some sort of diagram or flow chart that showed me exactly where things happened in this process so I could see it. I would also like it to be very clear that it's—that it would exclude situations such as—that should go through the normal Grievance Process. Something specific that says, "If a student feels they have been graded unfairly, the appropriate mechanism is...." and tell them very clearly in this Policy to go and

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** That's in there.

**Heston:** Ok. I just found it a little—I found it a little problematic to read and follow as it was structured. I know these are really hard to write, having been on that Committee.

**Peters:** That's V.A., Roman Numeral V.A. I think, Senator **Walter**, did you have your hand up a moment ago? Ok. Senator **Boyd**.

**Boyd:** V.A., though, is if a student feels his or her grade has been changed unjustly, not the initial grade unjustly, and so I think there's a valid point there.

**Peters:** Oh. You're right. [voices agreeing] Sorry. Senator **Kidd** hasn't participated yet, but \_\_\_\_\_ would be next.

**Kidd:** It appears, I think V.B. outlines how faculty are supposed to respond. I'm sorry [responding to someone indicating they couldn't hear him], V.B. outlines how faculty are supposed to respond if they see that a grade has been changed without their, you know, approval, I guess, or intent.

**Peters:** Right, and I think that Senator **Hitlan's**, I think, point was that by that point the grade has already been changed, so what's happening before that point.

**Kidd:** Oh, sorry.

**Peters:** Senator **Hitlan**.

**Hitlan:** Let's go ahead, a point sort of builds on what Melissa, Senator **Heston**, was saying in terms of the appeal of a grade change. And let's look at V.A. in terms of the student. So it indicates that the student should utilize the Grievance Process. What are the implications if the student doesn't utilize the formal Grievance Process, circumvents this process which has been known to happen and goes, you know, outside of the formal Grievance Process? What are the implications and in terms of, you know, due process being followed? Which we know due process hasn't been followed previously, so that "should," why can't we change that to

“must”? And then there would be implications if the student doesn’t go through the formal process, tries to circumvent it, that there are implications and then are consequences for doing that in terms of, you know, due process of the grievance. I’d be interested to know what other people think about.

**Peters:** Let me step in and just ask a question. I’m getting a sense—I mean, it’s pretty clear that some concerns are expressing—some of you are expressing concerns that, although it’s likely going to be rare, there might be times where students would essentially use this process as a way around the normal grade Grievance Process that the EPC, you know, that we drafted—that EPC drafted last year, and we approved last year. Is that kind of the concern? That this is

**Hitlan:** Yeah, that’s one concern. Yeah. Uh huh. Sure.

**Peters:** Ok, so what might alleviate that concern? Senator **Swan**.

**Swan:** I think that’s what Senator **Hitlan** said, that they must just use the Grievance Process so that even if an instructor dies, why don’t they use the Grievance Process that then would yield an appropriate outcome? “Oh, yes, the instructor’s dead, we’ll grade you now in some other means,” right? So that unusual circumstance could be handled by what we already have, and I think people are concerned about other unusual circumstances that aren’t stipulated that wouldn’t—that people don’t feel are legitimate. And the real issue isn’t so much faculty rights, although that’s very important because—but it’s not important in itself; it’s important because that preserves the integrity of the Institution, the grades given to all students when some students get grade changes that debase every student’s degree at the University, and so when anything is made onerous on faculty or anybody else to maintain the integrity of all degrees, that’s materially dangerous to our love and to our graduates. And I think that’s what some people are concerned about here, that we have processes, the Grievance Process already, that can handle exceptional circumstances, especially since they are so exceptional, we’re hearing, that they rarely, if ever, occur. The Grievance Process certainly can handle an occurrence that never happens, and then if it happens once, it can handle it. We make up

processes that are complex like this for things that happen a lot. We say, “Oh, we need to have some process that happens a lot.” So, I think, you know, saying as Senator **Hitlan** is saying, “must” just engage the Grievance Process, and we all know how that works, that preserves integrity of the grades for all students at the University.

**Peters:** So, Professor **Rhineberger-Dunn**, let me ask you, when—in—when the Committee—when the EPC discussed this, was there discussion at all about just—that all of these things just go through the normal Grievance Process, and how did that part of the discussion go itself?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** No, because if you, and theoretically speaking, the professor is teaching 3 courses with 60 students each and that faculty member dies, that’s a lot of paper and a lot of Grievance coming in, and I would fear that no one would volunteer. We didn’t discuss it, but my personal feeling, I would not volunteer to serve on such a committee if it’s possible that we’re going to have that many in one semester. It doesn’t—to me it doesn’t make sense to do that. I understand any grade change should go through the Grievance Process for students, but some of this isn’t—some of this really isn’t a grade change so much as it is the assignment of a grade. So, if they both are going to go through that process, then there is going to be cumbersome on that committee to deal with those grade changes, because it’s theoretically possible that a faculty member could leave 60, 120 students without assigning grades, but then they would have to go through the process to get an initial assignment of the grade.

**Peters:** Senator **DeBerg** and then Senator **Swan**.

**DeBerg:** I agree. It’s two different issues. One issue is if faculty members are unwilling or are unable to enter grades. Another issue is if they’ve entered grades and students want a grade change. So I believe that if a small amendment was made to IV.A., that would help me a lot. The last full sentence of the first paragraph under A. “In these cases, there is a need for the instructor’s department head/director to assign grades”—not change—or change an Incomplete comma, if appropriately qualified....so that we know that in this case we are talking about assigning initial grades, and the

only grade change that would happen is Incompletes would be graded, if the work came after the

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** As Research Contingents.

**DeBerg:** I'm sorry?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Incompletes and Research Contingents?

**DeBerg:** Whatever that means.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Continuances, whatever [voices attempting to clarify], after Research Continuing.

**DeBerg:** Ok. Whatever that means. And then that—and then we would know that this process at least in that section is talking about the assigning of the initial grades. I can't imagine a case in which a grade otherwise would be changed without the affected—the professor knowing ahead of time and approving it? Although it has happened here. I mean, I have documentation of that. I have memos between a Department Head and a faculty member about whether or not the Department Head should change a grade, and the faculty member said, "No! For these reasons." And the Department Head changed it anyway, so, I mean, those are the situations that we're talking about that are really dangerous to all the—in all the ways that Jesse [Senator **Swan**] has just outlined. So, I'm concerned that no Administrative Grade Change Policy ever permit what happened in that Department that I know about. I mean, it's completely unacceptable.

**Peters:** Should we take that as a motion to amend?

**DeBerg:** Well, yes, and so—I move that we amend to say "assign grades" delete "or change comma or change"—Incompletes or what's the other? Research [**Peters** makes changes on overhead so all can see.]

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Research Continues.

**DeBerg:** Incompletes or R whatever, RC—Research Contingents. [voices clarifying "Research Continuance" or "Continues"] "Continuances comma"



“if appropriately qualified.” And that keeps the idea of changing the grades out of this.

**Peters:** Does the change on the screen reflect what you just read to me? [voices clarifying what RC stands for; **Peters** makes changes.]

**DeBerg:** And I wouldn’t have any of it capitalized, but [voices clarifying whether to capitalize or put in quotes for emphasis]

**Peters:** We’ll just do both just to be safe. [light laughter around]

**DeBerg:** Ok, that makes me feel better about that.

**Peters:** Is there a second to that motion to amend?

**Walter:** Second.

**Peters:** Seconded by Senator **Walter**. We are now discussing the motion to amend. I’ll start with Chair **Funderburk**.

**Funderburk:** I like what you’re trying to do, but the only question I have is on some Incompletes. I’ve got two working now because people are physically unable to do performance-based things. They will turn to F’s before they recoup from their surgery, and if I’m just to suddenly disappear, this would cut those out, which are still technically an Incomplete.

**DeBerg:** I get it.

**Funderburk:** I don’t know how you’d word—use the wording to get to those grades resulting from an Incomplete.

**Heston:** Automatic F’s following Incompletes? I mean, that’s really what happens. They have an Incomplete, and it turns into an automatic F after a certain time.

**East:** But that’s covered above. [several voices overlapping]

**Peters:** Senator **East**, can you point to where that's covered.

**East:** "Incompletes/research continued that extend in the max...automatically turn into an F....."

**Heston:** Procedural Grade Change.

**East:** Item III.A.Bullet 2.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Right, number

**Licari:** No, but—but—I'm sorry.

**Peters:** Associate Provost **Licari** go ahead.

**Licari:** The point is what to do about the F after the work has been completed to get that F back to whatever grade a student you can give.

**East:** If that comes

**Heston:** Wouldn't that go through a Grievance Process?

**East:** That would go through a Grade Change Process, right? The faculty member could then institute the grade change.

**Licari:** But if the faculty member is gone or dead or whatever, then that's the issue at hand. [female voice clarifying] That's true.

**Peters:** Yeah, you would still have the Grievance Process.

**Licari:** And maybe \_\_\_\_\_ It would be rare.

**Peters:** Senator **Kidd** was waiting to be recognized, and then Senator **Gallagher** hasn't participated yet.

**Kidd:** Sure. I think take a look at IV.C. That also has the same kind of wording after it—“assign or change grades.” I’m not sure if that’s something we need to look at or not. Just if we were to change—also “change grades to Incompletes or Research Continuances.”

**Peters:** Is it appropriate to use similar language in IV.C. then?

**Kidd:** I think it’s appropriate.

**Peters:** Is there any objection to doing that? [**Peters** made change on projected Policy for all to see.]

**Peters:** Ok. Senator—Oh, point of information [recognizing Faculty Chair **Funderburk**]

**Funderburk:** Yeah. If a class is allowed to be withdrawn, instead of allowed to be—Is that considered a grade change? If it would show the class then as withdrawn; in other words, after the date, is that considered a grade change?

**Peters:** Withdraw after the drop date?

**Funderburk:** Yeah.

**Peters:** Associate Provost **Licari**, is that a grade change?

**Licari:** It would be considered an Administrative Grade Change covered in that earlier section, if the semester were already over and it was done retroactively, and we’ll get occasionally students with Student Requests that come to the Provost’s Office for that. Technically speaking, it is. They’ve gotten a grade in a class, and, you know, we examine the Request to see if it’s, you know, appropriate, something legitimate. But that’s covered, or at least discussed in III.A.Bullet 3.

**Peters:** Senator **Gallagher**.

**Gallagher:** Well, we actually had a faculty member who passed away several years ago. Wouldn't it be the case that another faculty member steps in to shepherd those students through? So I guess I'm wondering why, if there's a faculty member missing in action, for whatever reason, why would it not be another faculty member appointed to sort of shepherd through the process of the student finishing or students finishing the course? I guess I'm reluctant for the faculty to lose any more say so, power, whatever, however you want to put it. There's just a sense of things being taken out of faculty hands, and I'm just kind of reluctant to have that happen. I think that there are other ways to handle it.

**Peters:** Senator **Hitlan**.

**Hitlan:** Yes, just 3 more points real quick. So, first page under Procedural Grade Changes under A., the last sentence: "These situations do not require additional faculty input." Why don't Incompletes or Research Continued require additional faculty input?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** When they automatically turn to an F. If

**Hitlan:** Well, what if that's the correct grade? That that student never finished and the faculty was maybe a little lazy and didn't go in and enter the F, but the F is actually the correct grade.

**Peters:** I think the point is, if I understand correctly, that where the grade gets automatically changed, the faculty member doesn't have to do anything. It just happens.

**Hitlan:** Maybe that's the correct grade then.

**Hakes:** Maybe that's correct.

**Hitlan:** I mean, who is to say that that should've been changed and that's taken out of the faculty's hands. It doesn't seem right. [some voices commenting throughout]

**Peters:** I don't understand. I'm not following on that one. Can you explain that a little bit more, Senator **Hitlan**?

**Hitlan:** Yeah, if they get the Research Continued or the Incomplete turns to an F, maybe that's the correct grade in that that student never made up their Incomplete or never completed their Research, whatever it was, and as a result, they don't get any other grade, so it's an—turned to an F because they didn't complete what they were supposed to do in the first place. So, if they got that initially

**Peters:** I think that's what—I think that's what III.A. is trying—is saying, is that when that change happens, it requires no additional input from the faculty member because it is, in fact, the correct grade, because they didn't finish the work, and therefore it changes to an F.

**Heston:** This is not an Administrator changing. This doesn't refer to Administrator's changing grades. This refers to automatic grade changes that occur just because of the system that's set up,

**Peters:** Right.

**Heston:** and so then the student would have to grieve it, if they thought the F that they got when their Research Continued ran out of time—they'd have to grieve it through the regular Grievance Process, as I understand it.

**Swan:** That's the second bullet. The only time the Administrator might be changing it is the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet, right? A retroactive withdrawal.

**Peters:** Retroactive withdrawal.

**Swan:** But

**Peters:** But that goes through the Student Request Form through the Provost's Office. [voices commenting about it being a "W" or perhaps a medical withdrawal] Senator **Hitlan**.

**Hitlan:** Ok, I'll look on the brighter side and hope that's the case. Second would be with the Incompletes or the Research Continued, if it does go to an F and there is an appeal to change that or a Grievance to change that. Who determines what it is changed to? Is it automatically changed to an A? Thanks to the Grievance Process? [voices commenting]

**Peters:** Has that ever happened, Associate Provost **Licari**, where someone uses the Grievance Process to appeal an Incomplete that has changed to an F?

**Swan:** Oh, yeah. [overlapping voices]

**Licari:** Yeah, well, students—that's what students end up grieving the most about is perceived unfairness about grading. I don't know about that specific case of an Incomplete that matched to an F, but certainly all the Grievances that I've ever seen from students have been about grades. But if the—you know, and that's what would happen. If the student felt that they were—that they had finished the Incomplete and then therefore don't deserve the F, then they would have to file a Grievance to try to have that grade changed. And the faculty member would be the one to, if it was deemed legitimate, then the faculty member would have to grade the material and file the grade for it.

**Peters:** Then the faculty member would have to grade the material and file a grade at that point?

**Licari:** Yeah.

**Peters:** And then if the student was unhappy, I'm just following up here, if the student was unhappy with the grade at that point,

**Licari:** They could file another one.

**Peters:** There would be another Grievance saying, "Now that you've graded my material, I think you graded me unfairly." Ok.

**Swan:** And if the question then

**Peters:** Senator **Swan**.

**Swan:** had—well, I was just following up on the question, right, is—does the committee then assign the grade? If the professor said, “No, this is an F,” but the committee says “No, it’s not an F.” And so then does the committee assign a grade or is it always just an A instead of—is it always just

**Licari:** No, it’s not just an A.

**Swan:** I didn’t think so, so the committee must assign the grade, is that right? Ok. Yes, that’s what it sounds like it should be.

**Peters:** Ok.

**Hitlan:** One more point.

**Peters:** Senator **Hitlan** had one more point.

**Hitlan:** And this concerns I guess—the bottom of—I went through this in some detail—bottom of page 2, top of page 3, so this is after the grade’s been changed, so Appeal of the Grade Change, and it’s under B. [V.B.] So a couple of things. After the grade change has taken place [pause]

**Peters:** You know, we have actually—I—I’ll go—I’m going to allow Rob [Senator **Hitlan**] to finish, but after that we have really gotten off the discussion of the amendment, and that’s my fault for letting that happen, but I’ll go ahead and let Senator **Hitlan** finish.

**Hitlan:** Yeah, this is pretty quick. So basically after the grade change has occurred, is my understanding, that, you know, if the faculty member has issues with the grade change that occurred, apparently the Department Head would go talk to him or her, and if there’s no—nothing happens as the result of that, if they’re both still at odds, they can’t come to some agreement, then the Dean talks to this faculty member. Now, so the grade change has already occurred, and the faculty member has issues with it, so

one thing that happens is that that Department Head goes and talks to them about it, and then the Dean talks to them about it, and then eventually a panel—a faculty panel—would be put in place. I'm sure the Committee had to've thought about the potential for coercion here. If you've got an untenured faculty member, and you've got a Department Head telling them that "You need to—this is what's going to happen, you need to go along with it." And if the faculty member says "No," then the Dean comes on board, and says, "You should go along with this," because the grade's already been changed. So, how is that not coercion? I don't get it? Maybe it's just me.

**Peters:** Let me try to steer us back. We'll return to that question. I'll mark it and star it, but I allowed debate to get away from us. We should be debating the amendment that's on the floor to change the text. Is there any further debate on that amendment to change the text in both A and C as noted here, IV.A. and C. Senator **Swan**, I see your hand.

**Swan:** That's number IV, ok. Yeah, so I think this is debate on that amendment, because I'm still arguing against having section IV or changing it in some other ways very significantly. I'm concerned about unusual circumstances generally, and why the Grievance Process Committee can't do it, if it ever—if any committee becomes overburdened, it then seeks further help, including maybe subcommittees formed by other people, etc. Certainly, an unusual circumstance would call for that. More people could be brought in. No one committee should ever feel it's isolated. It should always ask for further help when needed. And, of course, these are unusual circumstances that we're told never happen, so we shouldn't just think about that. Secondly, it's easy and awfully tempting when one feels pressured and harried and overworked and under-budgeted etc. to find quick, easy solutions. And any situation such as "unusual circumstances" provides that. It becomes very difficult for Administrators in tight circumstances not to see this as an expeditious avenue to then interpret many, many things as "unusual" that should actually just go to the Grievance Process, but because of some twist it seems unusual. For instance, the final bullet under IV.A., I suppose—an "Instructor is unwilling or refuses to enter an initial grade," there are many reasons—tensions between and amongst, legitimate tensions that need to be resolved



between and amongst students, faculty, and Administrators that would cause this delay. And so for an Administrator to just be able to say, “Oh, clearly you’re refusing to enter a grade. I can use this Policy now of....”—it subverts the best outcome, the best, fairest outcome for everyone involved. That’s just too broad, too open. Certainly when then we’re—we ask, “Well, when is a situation when an instructor refuses to enter a grade?” then we’re told, “Well, she dies.” I say, “Well, ok, we have ways of proceeding about that.” Others maybe are much more serious and much more difficult to deal with but without—so if we don’t know what they are and we just have this here, we open up the avenue of making our grades and the standards we use to preserve their integrity seem at least not apparently as solid as they have been before. And so I’m concerned with the whole, I guess, section or article, whatever, number IV Unusual Circumstances not having more direct faculty governance oversight, that faculty decisions are, you know, moving forward in that whole thing, and that’s why the amendment doesn’t solve any of those problems for me, and in that sense I’m against this amendment yet I’m for other ways of handling these circumstances. Thank you.

**Peters:** Senator **DeBerg**, on the amendment.

**DeBerg:** Well, I would like to withdraw it, because it’s dawned on me that we can’t—that I hope that the comments that we’re making will be taken back to EPC and maybe major revisions will be made. So I’m withdrawing the amendment. So I have two comments. The same language of “assign and/or change” is in B., so to the extent that A. and C. in IV—no, to the extent that IV, the language in A. and C. opened it up to changing, not just assigning initial grades, the language in B. does the same. So I’m just pointing that out. And under the Unusual Circumstances, I think it needs to be very clear that no case prior to the day when grades are ordinarily due would ever by an unusual circumstance, no matter when an internship comes up, no matter when, you know, something that a student might have going on, under no circumstance could a grade ever be entered prior to the date when the semester grades are due. I mean, that just seems to be common sense, but this language would make that possible. So I think that needs to be in there.

**Peters:** Are there other comments? Senator **Heston**.

**Heston:** Right, I'm not quite sure how to do this, but I would like to see this returned to Committee [the EPC]. I don't know if that's a substitute motion or what the procedure is.

**Peters:** Certainly we can just have a motion to refer it back to the Committee.

**Heston:** So I move we refer it back to the Committee.

**Peters:** Is there a second?

**Terlip:** Second.

**Peters:** Seconded by Senator **Terlip**. Any further discussion on this?

**Swan:** So, back to the point of order, just so it's clear in the Minutes, and some faculty do read the Minutes, right?

**Peters:** Yes.

**DeBerg:** More and more.

**Swan:** Well, I see we had an amendment that was seconded, and the tradition of the Body has been to allow the sponsors of the such amendment or motions to simply withdraw.

**Peters:** To withdraw it.

**Swan:** I'm not opposing that right now. But I want that to be said, that we are, even though it's violating common practice, right?

**Peters:** Correct.

**Swan:** You were the sponsor of the amendment [to **DeBerg**].

**DeBerg:** Who was my second?

**Peters:** Yes, Senator **Walter**.

**Swan:** And so then—so I just sort of stipulated that it's our practice to allow that. It's a local practice. And so we're back to the original motion which was to accept this, right?

**Peters:** Yes, that's

**Swan:** And so now we have to do something with that, and

**Peters:** Ok. You're right. Thank you.

**Swan:** And then move to send it back to the Committee.

**Peters:** Well, yes, you're right. The motion by the Committee is to—was to accept its recommendations. So, I mean, it comes to us as a Report from the Committee to accept its recommendations. That in and of itself is a motion.

**Swan:** Oh, so ok, so then we're

**Peters:** So, you know, under our Robert's Rules, when a Committee is given a task and it reports its results, that in and of itself is the motion. So, I guess, the motion on the table is the set of recommendations itself

**Swan:** From the Committee.

**Peters:** I guess, from the Committee.

**Swan:** But we didn't have—well, the docketers could be sponsors then here, in a way.

**Peters:** Sure. Yes.

**Swan:** And we could just have a secondary motion to send it back to the Committee for further work drawn from the discussion and the Minutes, and I guess that was Melissa's [Senator **Heston**] motion.

**Peters:** And that was Senator **Heston**'s motion which was seconded by Senator **Terlip**.

**Swan:** Ok. Ok. Very good.

**Peters:** Which I think is, if we do it that way, I think is in order.

**Swan:** I think so.

**Peters:** Did I see a hand over on this side out of the corner of my eye? Senator **Terlip**?

**Terlip:** Yeah. I get nervous when we put language in that says "reasonable" because I think a student's definition of what's a reasonable time to act and a faculty member's, you know, what's reasonable to act may be different. So "I just discovered I can get this internship if only this grade is changed, and I need it in 3 days," as opposed to a Grievance Policy, so I think we need to kind of define what we mean by that notion of "reasonable."

**Peters:** Any—and, yes, Professor **Rhineberger-Dunn**.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** The Committee discussed the use of the word "reasonable," so if the Senate could provide more specific direction to the EPC on specifics other than what has occurred today, because the problem with quantifying something like "reasonable" in this Policy doesn't work. And so either—I mean, there has to be a little bit more guidance than from the Senate on what the Senate wants in the Policy.

**Peters:** Because this wasn't just a matter of a time period. It was a question of

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** It's a matter of circumstances.

**Peters:** of circumstances.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** And it's not "reasonable" to assign a grade or change a grade because "I want it. I'm going out of the country, and I decide I want to have my transcript before I go." That's not reasonable. But if—or a circumstance. So there's the time, and there's the circumstance. And so this will go back to the Committee, sure, but a little bit more guidance from just as what happened with the last couple of \_\_\_\_\_ [sounded like "super caps"] that a little more guidance to the EPC would be helpful.

**Peters:** Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** Well, ok. So, during the school year faculty members oftentimes go to conferences, so maybe 2 weeks during the school year. During the Summer, faculty members sometimes study abroad, go on research trips, or are out digging at an archeological dig or something, and so I think "reasonable in the Summer" is a lot longer than "reasonable during the academic year."

**Peters:** Well, I think at this point is that this—I think—you know, I think—I suspect that the Committee would agree with you, but I think the point is also that here it's not just a time period, it's total cir—it's the

**DeBerg:** I understand that. But

**Peters:** of how the total circumstances about why they might need something.

**DeBerg:** I understand that, but should a faculty member ever be required to respond in less than 10 work days?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** They do in the Grievance Policy.

**DeBerg:** Well, ok. What's the Grievance Policy deadline?

**Peters:** The expedited Grievance Policy deadline, is it 5 days? It might even be less than that.

**DeBerg:** Well, you could use that as a precedent.

**Peters:** Senator **Swan**.

**Swan:** Just about that, if a faculty committee is overseeing this, I would feel comfortable about that faculty committee judging, and in the different cases, what's reasonable. So here it was 2 days, but there it's 7 months, if a faculty committee is making those decisions. So that's—I mean, I'm offering that as some of—some further direction. So, yes, we need to use reasonable, but now it's who is adjudicating what in a specific case is reasonable, and I'm suggesting faculty, faculty committee, faculty input.

**Peters:** Chair **Funderburk**, and then Senator **Terlip**, and then Senator **East**.

**Funderburk:** As it appears this is going back to Committee for some more work, I also had a question. Rather than the faculty member needing to respond within 5 days after the grade was changed, if there was any particular reason not to turn it around a bit and say that the faculty member is notified 5 days before the change would occur to give them plenty of time, as opposed to potentially making it that much messier. I don't know if there was a reason not to notify the faculty in advance, but it would seem to me that would be the first choice, is 5 days, 10 days, prior to any change.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** So, were you asking why weren't—why—could faculty be notified 5 days in advance of when a grade change is going to occur?

**Funderburk:** More rhetorical than anything else. Going back to the Committee, it was more rhetorical than anything else. Since everything here is based on the fact that it's changed without advance notification, I just wonder why the Policy couldn't say "In the event of a grade change, the faculty member is notified 5 class days in advance of when the change will occur" thereby allowing the faculty member time, if there's a reason this shouldn't happen, to raise their case.

**Peters:** Senator **Terlip**.

**Terlip:** Yeah, I think if what—we've got several issues. One is addressing when a grade has been changed, but I think the other issue is just simply notification, and it might be simpler if a faculty member was always notified when a grade was changed, even if it was that automatic thing. I mean, if it's just generating an email to us through the SIS, that shouldn't be labor-intensive, and that way, you know, we could say, "Oh, my gosh, this is the student who I'd forgotten about. This is going to be changed in 5 days, then I think they're coming back to grad. school and might want to finish." So, it could work to the student's advantage, too, if we had that notice ahead of time.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** I think the issue will now be a question for the Registrar because if it's by a student basis, you're going to get—how many students do you have in a semester?—200 emails that, I mean, if it works off of any change to a grade. So, it could be in the case of you forgot to enter grades or you couldn't enter grades because of something, then you're going to get all of those emails for the 60 students you didn't enter a grade for, if it's by them. So, it's a question for the Registrar to see if it's possible.

**Terlip:** Yeah, but that would be unlikely. I'm thinking about when an Incomplete automatically turns to an F. I think maybe the Department may get something, but I don't get it. I mean, they don't notify me.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Right.

**Terlip:** And I'm not even sure if they notify the students. Do they notify the students?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** I don't know.

**Peters:** I think it's just—yeah.

**Terlip:** I mean, we have the capability of emailing both parties now. I think that would be wise.

**Peters:** Senator **East**.

**East:** I think Senator **Gallagher**'s comment about the faculty member being responsible for the grades and that someone is appointed to be responsible for the grades maybe should be part of the going back to the Committee also. The idea that—my understanding is that all this started because we didn't want the Administration arbitrarily changing grades without—we didn't want the Administration changing grades that a faculty had awarded. And so now we've got a Policy that mostly speaks to a Grievance Process and special circumstances but doesn't really come out and say "The Administration—the Administrators should never change grades awarded by faculty member except in some particular case." And it seems like—I mean, I think that's sort of been lost in this Policy, that it somehow—the idea that faculty members award grades; Administrators do not. Administrators do not change grades other than in these special circumstances. And that gets lost in this Policy.

**Terlip:** And if they do, people ought to be notified.

**East:** Well

**Terlip:** Yeah, no, but if they do, we should have to be notified.

**East:** I just think that a policy that addresses both of these—tries to address both of these at the same time, as Professor **Gallagher** is suggesting, is confusing. And it needs to keep the two very separate, clearly separate. If a faculty member, as she has suggested, a faculty member dies a week before class is out, another faculty member is—or the Department Head is appointed to finish that term, and it becomes the instructor of record in that kind of case, it would seem to me. And the same would be true if the faculty member left campus and didn't fill out grades. I mean, so it just seems to me that, again, this is much more complicated than it—than what we would have anticipated a Policy that



says “Administration can’t change grades after faculty have awarded them.”

**Peters:** Any further comm—Senator **Hakes**.

**Hakes:** Well, this gets to your point that it seems like some of this document is about special cases of the faculty dies. And if the real issue is that we don’t want people changing our grades unless we’re notified, actually after I’m gone, you can do whatever you want. [laughter around] You know, I mean, why are we messing—this document with this special case of when a faculty member is dead and doesn’t record their grades, that has nothing to do with our issue. It gets tangled up because of the language, but it’s not the issue.

Male voice: I would agree.

**DeBerg:** I wonder if I’m alive when I’m in a vegetative state? [laughter around and voices joking]

**Peters:** Senator **Kirmani**.

**Kirmani:** I have a related question, probably Associate Provost **Licari** may be able to tell me. What are the current rules for an automatic change of RC to F? How many semesters can a student have RC?

**Licari:** Basically, the instructor needs to continue to file those.

**Kirmani:** But for how long can he or she do that?

**Licari:** As long as the instructor continues to file them.

**Terlip:** But at a certain point you run out of time to complete the M.A.

**Kirmani:** Yet but that you see, for example, 4 years, 5 years.

**Licari:** You've got recency requirements to finish your degree. The RC issue, quite frankly, is really not an issue. The Incomplete [voices overlapping]

**Kirmani:** It is, because you see that I have several students who have not been able to complete their projects, for example, that they're getting RC's, and part of the reason is that they are working, so—but I have given them, for example, deadline that look like I will not renew your RC for more than 2 semesters.

**Licari:** Ok, I mean, that strikes me that it is an instructor's prerogative to assign grades.

**Kirmani:** But what are the rules? I mean, that's your end of \_\_\_\_\_ Is there anything written anywhere that an RC will not continue for more than 4 years?

**Peters:** I think what he said was that it can continue as long as the faculty member is willing to allow it to continue.

**Licari:** It's that if you wish to stop giving the RC's that that's your prerogative as the instructor.

**Peters:** Senator **Dolgener**, did you have something on that point.

**Dolgener:** Yes, the Registrar is starting sending out notices on RC after I'm not sure how long, but they ask you if you want to continue the RC's for these students going forward? And you say "yea" or "nay."

**Peters:** Associate Provost **Licari**.

**Licari:** Yeah, and that's a result of, you know, graduate students sometimes just kind of \_\_\_\_\_. They don't finish. They go off, and they work, and their interest in finishing their degree diminishes as time goes on, and that's just a prompt to the instructors to remind you that it's your prerogative to either continue issuing these RC's or to stop.

**Peters:** Senator **Heston**.

**Heston:** I just—I want to be very clear about what this Policy is to address. It seems to me that the issue of the incapacitation of a faculty member, departure of a faculty member from the University without turning in grades, or death warrant regular handling by Department Head to reassign those responsibilities to an appropriate faculty member. I don't see why we need a special policy. Those are affecting large groups of people. It seemed to me that what this was about were those faculty members who, for whatever reason, do not turn their grades in on time—and I do know that there are faculty who do that—and/or for some particular reason have a conflict, and it's hard for me to imagine, but are actively refusing to give a student a grade even though the due date for a grade is passed. Is that an accurate understanding of what this is meant to address?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** That's correct. [very quiet—perhaps said “Absolutely”]

**Heston:** So, that's a very specific faculty issue that I think sho—I think the Policy should be written very specifically to address that, not to try and address all of these other circumstances for which I think we have mechanisms in place. I mean—and I can't imagine a faculty member being allowed to refuse to turn in a grade after the grades are due.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Actually,

**Heston:** Before the grades are due, I can see a faculty member refusing, but after

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** That happened.

**Heston:** after grades are due? Well, I mean, at that point somebody's out of compliance with contract or something, right? I mean, you have an obligation. We have a professional obligation to turn in grades.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** The Registrar has given the example that there is a facul—there is at least one faculty member on campus who refuses to

enter F's. So, if they have an F for a student, they just don't enter anything, so the Registrar has to assign the grade. [voices commenting]

**Heston:** Well, I—but I think that's an issue with that faculty member not following through. I don't know that you get that. I mean, is that a faculty right to refuse to enter an F? I mean, at the University—the University has policies that you give these grades. If you don't want to give an F, give something else. But you have to enter a grade. I mean, I don't see why this should be such a big issue. But I agree with Dr. **East**, Administrators should not be changing grades ever, ever. That should go through some sort of Grievance Process through the Faculty Grievance Process issue where faculty decide what should happen or the student takes it to the Student Grievance Process issue. But Administrative changes by Department Heads or Deans or Provosts or Presidents should never, ever happen.

**Peters:** Senator **Hakes**.

**Hakes:** There is only one grade change that, having sat on a Readmissions Committee, that I would see regularly and that is the W for people that appeal their entire semester. Now, that's the only case, and when you say that never, I agree, never, ever. That's one of things that that could be a very narrow case. And the other question I have possibly is, I've never seen it, but does the Registrar ever change a single course to a W while leaving the others? I have no problems with a semester being wiped out. Somebody was ill, was in a hospital, didn't notify anyone. They come back with the evidence, and they want that semester removed. And that's done regularly. But I would be upset if somebody was ill for Economics but not for Physics. [laughter around] So that I—if a single grade is changed to a W, then I believe that we've violated our basic understanding of what the

**Licari:** And that, yes, that's the type of thing through the Student Request that they could ask for their retroactive withdrawal from the semester. It's all or none

**Hakes:** All or none. I'm comfortable with that.

**Licari:** And because exactly for that reason. You can't be, you know,

**Hakes:** You can't be sick for one course and not for another.

**Peters:** Chair **Funderburk**.

**Funderburk:** Because I'm always being contrary, actually you can. In the applied areas, as the gall bladder surgery case I'm dealing with, they were perfectly fine to do their written stuff, but they couldn't take a deep breath and play a tuba. So, they couldn't do the work.

**Peters:** All right. We have 5 minutes left in our time remaining. Is there any further aid we can give the Committee before referring it back?  
Senator **Hitlan**.

**Hitlan:** Yeah, I just wanted to make sure that this is on record. In terms of, you know, the ad hoc Faculty Committee is going to be remaining

**Peters:** It's the EPC, the Educational Policies Commission, so it's a standing committee of the faculty.

**Hitlan:** No, the ad hoc Faculty Committee

**Peters:** Oh, sorry.

**Hitlan:** is within this Policy is to remain in the document, that it actually be a faculty committee and not composed of two admin and one faculty member.

**Peters:** The coercion point or from \_\_\_\_\_  
[our error?]. Thank you. My sense is that we should just refer this back to Committee. Is there any objection to proceeding in that way? To referring it back to Committee? Seeing none, we'll do that. I do want to take a moment though. As Gayle [**Rhineberger-Dunn**] mentioned, she's chaired this Committee for 2 years. In our structure of governance, I think chairing these faculty committees and working, not just chairing, but working on these faculty committees can be very difficult because they are comprised of faculty members who are not themselves on this Body, and they have to

work and try to anticipate our objections, and then they bring their work to us, and even when it's stellar work, sometimes they face more objections than they counted on. While Gayle has been Chair, the EPC has brought to this Body, and we have approved, changes in the Grievance Process, changes in Academic Misconduct. Help me out. What else am I forgetting? I jotted them all down.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Twice for Make-Up and Attendance. [light laughter around]

**Peters:** Make-Up and Attendance twice.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Three times if we count the nominating committee [?].

**Terlip:** Electronic Devices.

**Peters:** Electronic Devices Policy. And it has weighed in on other things like Dead Days Resolutions for the NISG. It has done all of this, sometimes on very short notice. Gayle has done all of this work and led the Committee through all of this with no complaint, at least not to me, maybe to others but at least not to me. The work that they give to us is always, I think, remarkable in the level of detail, the thought the Committee has put into it, and I just want to take this opportunity on behalf of the Senate and on behalf of the faculty to thank you very much for your service in chairing this Committee [applause all around].

DOCKET #1087, CREATION OF FACULTY COMMITTEES AND PROCEDURES TO IMPLEMENT MASTER AGREEMENT DUE PROCESS STANDARDS FOR DISMISSAL OF FACULTY, REGULAR ORDER (**MacLin/Kidd**)

DOCKET #1079, RECOMMENDATIONS OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM REVIEW—FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS, REGULAR ORDER, (**MacLin/Kidd**)

**Peters:** We have 3 minutes left, so all in favor of approving the due process [laughter all around].... All right, here is what I think we should do on this. We've got a meeting next week, special meeting next week. We have two major issues left: this faculty due process issue and the recommendations from the ad hoc Committee on Curriculum Processes and Policy. That latter Committee, most likely what I think we're going to ask the Senate to do is to bring forward a couple of policy recommendations to change University Policy about Curriculum and then for the Senate to give its stamp of approval to the broad outlines for how the Curriculum Handbook should be changed and whether this new committee should be created next year to help monitor curriculum, ok?

The due process standards are—in one sense they are tricky and tedious. In another sense, we don't have a—we have very limited choices we can make. The Master Agreement has set up this process where there has to be something called the Faculty Welfare Committee, and there is a mechanism of creating a Hearing Committee in which the Senate is integral. So United Faculty has asked us to try to at least approve the basic structure in charge of the Faculty Welfare Committee and at least approve the basic process for selecting members of that Hearing Committee, and so if we can do that next week, I would very much like to. Our time on this has been short, I understand, and we'll see what we can do next week. In the meantime, you've had the chance to review the document I sent you. Let's take advantage of the email list, if you have specific suggestions. I laid out a couple different alternatives. If one of those alternatives is clearly preferable than others, please let's send email accordingly and see if we can at least maybe narrow down some of our options and expedite the meeting next week. Senator **East**.

**East:** The Faculty Welfare Committee in one of your options was to have a member from each College, but that, I mean—the description of the Faculty Welfare Committee in the other document that was related to this says 3 members. Or so I believe it did.

**Peters:** The description I believe says that the Faculty Welfare Committee shall appoint an inquiry committee of 3 members. I don't think the document says how many people are on the Faculty Welfare Committee.

**East:** Ok, maybe I misread it. I will look further. I will reexamine.

**Terlip:** [too quiet to hear; perhaps reading from document]

**Peters:** And so on there might, you know—well, we're about over time, so you've read my document, so we'll do our best with this next week.

ADJOURNMENT (5:01 p.m.)

**Peters:** If there's nothing else, and if there's no objection, we'll stand adjourned until next week at 3:30. Thank you everybody.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss  
Transcriptionist  
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:

04/29/13  
Maucker Union Oak Room  
3:30 p.m.

Follows is 1 Addendum to these Minutes.



## Addendum 1 of 1

### **Administrative Grade Change Policy**

#### I. Purpose

A. According to university policy, only the instructor(s) of record for a course may award or change grades for that course, and must do so following university policy/procedures (e.g., filling out a Change of Grade form). Under unusual circumstances, however, it may be necessary to involve others in the assignment or changing of grades.

B. Recognizing that grade determinations are an integral part of an instructor's rights and responsibilities, administrative officers should not substitute their judgment for that of the faculty concerning the assignment of a grade without seeking the input from an academic grievance panel. Occasionally, unusual circumstances may require that other individuals are involved in the assignment of grades or changing of grades. The purpose of this policy is to establish circumstances in which university administrators may assign or make changes to assigned grades.

#### II. Notification

A. The instructor(s) of record and his/her/their department head/director must be notified by email anytime there is an alteration to a student's grade that is outside of the standard grading procedure.

#### III. Procedural Grade Changes

A. There are some circumstances in which a grade change may occur as a result of a particular university policy or procedure. These situations do not require additional faculty input. Examples include:

- Grade change as a result of a completed grievance process.
- Incompletes/research continued that extend the maximum time limit for completion automatically turn into an F letter grade.
- Retroactive withdrawals that are approved by the Provost's Office.

#### IV. Unusual Circumstance

A. Under unusual circumstances an instructor of record may be unable or unwilling to assign grades in a timely manner, yet there is a compelling need to complete the grading process (e.g., student would be eligible to graduate, the course is a prerequisite for other courses, etc.). In these cases, there is a need for the instructor's department head/director to assign or change grades if appropriately qualified, or to designate a qualified faculty member to evaluate the work and to assign the grade. Examples of such circumstances include:

- Death or incapacitation of instructor
- Instructor permanently left the university and refuses/fails to respond

- When attempts to reach the instructor have failed after a reasonable time has passed. “Reasonable time” is contingent upon the circumstances. Examples of exigent circumstances include: student cannot get funding for graduate school or a particular scholarship unless they have all grades submitted; cannot begin an internship or start a job unless they show they have successfully completed a particular course. The determination that someone other than the instructor of record should assign a grade or make a grade change is also dependent upon the actions of the requesting students to notify the appropriate parties in a timely manner.
- Instructor is unwilling or refuses to enter an initial grade(s).

B. If an administrator other than the department head/director identifies a situation where the department head/director is needed to assign/change grades or to designate a qualified faculty member to do so, this administrator must send the head/director an electronic message stating the circumstances surrounding the request and the specific task being requested of the head/director. If the department head/director needs to designate a faculty member to assign/change grades, she/he must send that faculty member an electronic message stating the circumstances surrounding the request, and outline the specific task being asked of the faculty member.

1. In either case above, the requesting party must notify the appropriate college dean and the registrar’s office of the circumstances surrounding the request, outline the steps being taken to remedy the situation, and secure the ability of the head/director or faculty member to physically enter grades.

C. In the circumstances outlined in section IV, letter A above, a department head/director and an appropriate college dean may request the administrator to assign or change grades on behalf of students after a reasonable length of time to allow the instructor to act. The requesting party should:

1. Send a written or electronic message briefly stating the circumstances surrounding the request.
  - a. If possible, the requesting party should provide written or electronic documentation that the faculty member involved is not willing to or is incapable of entering or changing the grade.
2. Include documentation, if any, for the proposed grade to be entered or for an alternation of an existing grade.

## V. Appeal of a Grade Change

A. If a student feels that his/her grade has been changed unjustly, the student should utilize the grievance process. Information on the grievance process can be found under university policy [12.01 Student Academic Grievance](#).

B. If an instructor believes that a grade has been inappropriately changed, she/he has the right to file an appeal within five class days of receiving the automatic notification of a grade change from the registrar's office. Class days refers to university class days during the regular fall and spring semesters. An appeal consists of an email to the department head/director indicating the course information, student(s) name(s) and ID number(s), the initial grade given by the faculty member, the grade change, a statement of the specific nature of the appeal, and a recommendation for resolution.

1. The department head/director shall set a meeting with the instructor(s) within five class days of receiving the electronic appeal in attempt to informally resolve the appeal. The department head/director shall provide a written statement indicating if the parties were able to informally resolve the appeal. This statement shall be electronically distributed within 48 hours to the instructor(s), the registrar and the dean.
2. If no formal resolution is reached in this department head/director meeting, the dean of the instructor's college shall meet with the instructor(s) within five class days in attempt to resolve the appeal. The dean shall provide a written statement indicating if the parties were able to resolve the appeal. This statement shall be electronically distributed within 48 hours to the instructor(s), the registrar, the department head/director and the provost.
3. If no formal resolution is reached in the meeting with the dean, a three member faculty committee shall be formed by the registrar, who acts as a neutral, non-voting member in this matter. The committee shall be formed within 10 class days of the report from the dean's meeting with the instructor(s). This committee will render a final decision on the appeal.
  - a. The three member faculty committee shall consists of the following:
    - i. a faculty member chosen by the appealing instructor
    - ii. a department head outside of the department of the appealing instructor but from within the instructor's college, as chosen by the registrar, and
    - iii. the chair of the faculty. (In the case of a conflict of interest between the appealing instructor and the chair of the faculty, the chair of the faculty senate shall sit on this appeals committee.)
  - b. The committee shall meet within 10 calendar days (excluding holidays) of formation to consider the appeal and render a decision. The committee will investigate and consider any information it deems necessary to make their decision. The committee shall complete its work and send a report to the parties listed below in section V, part B, number 3, letter d within 14 calendar days of the initial meeting.

c. It may be necessary, in the interest of justice, to extend a specified time limit when the parties involved in the appeals cannot be reached in a timely fashion by telephone, mail, email or other form of communication, or when the principal(s) may be absent from the campus or temporarily indisposed due to illness, accident, injury or other extenuating circumstances. Time limits may be extended in these circumstances by the registrar as appropriate.

d. The specific findings of the committee will be strictly confidential, and reported only to the student whose grade was changed, the instructor(s), the department head/director, the dean, and the registrar to ensure that the committee's decision is acted upon in cases where the instructor(s) appeal is granted.

4. Except as disclosures are reasonably necessary in the investigation, meetings, and final disposition of an appeal, the instructor(s), the members of hearing bodies, and others having knowledge of an appeal are expected to preserve the confidentiality of the appeal.