

UNIVERSITY SENATE
Fourth Meeting, Monday, 23 January 2006, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

AGENDA

1. Call to order Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina
2. Approval of Minutes of 21 November 2005
3. Acceptance of Agenda
4. [Remarks by the President](#) President Martin C. Jischke
5. [Report of the Chairperson](#) Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina
6. [Resume of Items Under Consideration](#)
by Various Standing Committees For Information
Professor Herbert L. Weith
7. Question Time
8. [University Senate Document 05-5](#)
Alternative to Redlining For Discussion
Professor George M. Bodner
9. [University Senate Document 05-6](#)
Changes to University Grade Appeals System For Discussion
Professor Mark Morgan
10. New Business
11. Memorial Resolutions
12. Adjournment

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Fourth Meeting, Monday, 23 January 2006, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

Present: *President Martin C. Jischke, Timothy L. Skvarenina (Chairperson of the Senate) presiding, Professors Ann W. Astell, Carol L. Baird, Thomas Bauman, Alan M. Beck, Rodney J. Bertolet, JennieMarie Blankert, Antonio Bobet, George M. Bodner, J. Stuart Bolton, Stephen R. Byrn, Joseph W. Camp Jr. (Secretary of Faculties and Parliamentarian), Natalie J. Carroll, Susan E. Conners, Patrick E. Connolly, Christine L. Corum, Lawrence P. DeBoer, Sharon DeVaney, Linda M. Duttlinger, Janusz Duzinkiewicz, Richard O. Fanjoy, Scott L. Feld, Wendy S. Flory, Greg N. Frederickson, April J. Ginther, Gabriele F. Giuliani, Alten F. Grandt Jr., John G. Graveel, James P. Greenan, Bruce R. Hamaker, William A. Harper, Nathan W. Harter, Sally A. Hastings, L. Tony Hawkins, Douglass F. Jacobs, Vicki J. Killion, Wayne W. Kjonaas, Charles E. Kline, Sivakumar S. Krishnan, Robert A. Kubat, Christine M. Ladisch, Michael L. Leasure, Morris Levy, Andrew U. Luescher, Sean M. McDeavitt, James D. McGlothlin, David R. McMillin, Cary A. Mitchell, Robert E. Montgomery, Mark T. Morgan, Mark M. Moriarty, P. Jane Morris (Sergeant at Arms), Hisao Nakanishi, Cindy H. Nakatsu, David E. Nichols, Morgan R. Olsen, Richard C. Penney, Carolyn C. Perrucci, Laura J. Pyrak-Nolte, Thomas B. Robinson, George E. Rogers, Alysa C. Rollock, F. Robert Sabol, John A. Sautter, Louis A. Sherman, Bernard Y. Tao, Alain S. Togbe, Marion T. Trout, Philip J. VanFossen, Ralph Webb Jr., H. Lee Weith, David J. Williams, G. Thomas Wilson, Yuehwern Yih, and William J. Zinsmeister.*

Absent: *Professors Olayiwola Adeola, Howard Adler, Kristine J. Anderson, James R. Bottum, Charles A. Bouman, Mark D. Bowman, James E. Braun, Yan Chen, John J. Contreni, John P. Denton, Otto C. Doering III, Joseph C. Dorsey, David R. Gaskell, Jessica D. Hoffman, R. Neal Houze, J.L. Jenkins, Daniel J. Kovenock, Ananthanarayan Krishnan, Thomas Kuczek, C.S. George Lee, Julie R. Mariga, Sally Mason, Rabindra N. Mukerjee, Ganesan Narsimhan, Michael R. Oliver, Frank V. Paladino, Barry R. Pittendrigh, Patrice D. Rankine, J. Paul Robinson, William T. Robinson, Keith E. Schwingendorf, Jie Shen, Glenn G. Sparks, A. Charlene Sullivan, Volker K. Thomas, Gerald S. Wasserman, Sirje Laurel Weldon, Clarence W. Wilkerson, and Michael D. Zoltowski.*

Guests: *Ben Arjomandi, Chris Leasure, Deb Sheets, Lori Shipley, and Mike Talbott*

1. The meeting was called to order by the chairperson of the senate, Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina at 2:35 p.m.
2. The minutes of the meeting of 21 November 2005 were approved as distributed.
3. The agenda was accepted as proposed.
4. President Martin C. Jischke presented remarks to the Senate (see Appendix A). Following his remarks he responded to questions from the floor.
5. Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina presented the report of the chairperson (see Appendix B). Following his report, Professor Skvarenina made two announcements. First, the Nominations Committee is seeking candidates for the office of Vice Chair in 2006-2007. The individual elected as Vice Chair will become Chair in 2007-2008. Anyone interested in running for the position should contact Professor Charles Kline Chair of the Nominations Committee, or Professor Joe Camp, Secretary of Faculties. Second, all

faculty should have received an email from Bill Harper inviting them to participate in the faculty survey. Senators are asked to participate and encourage their colleagues to do so, as well. Professor Duttlinger inquired whether regional faculty were included in the email. Professor Harper replied they were not as the survey was intended only for West Lafayette.

6. Professor H. Lee Weith, the chair of the Steering Committee presented, for information, the Resume of Items Under Consideration by Various Standing Committees (see Appendix C). Professor Mark Morgan, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, rose to provide an update on the items under consideration by his committee. In particular, he mentioned that the committee had discussed disbanding the Collective Bargaining Committee, but the motion to do so died for lack of a second. Other items under discussion include automatic extension of the tenure clock for special, well-defined circumstances and the issue of a non-tenure track clinical professor serving as a department head. Currently, a clinical professor can serve as head of a department in a special situation if the Provost has made an exception to the usual practice.
7. At question time the secretary reported no questions had been submitted in writing and the chair invited questions from the floor. No questions were forthcoming.
8. Professor George Bodner presented, for discussion, University Senate Document 05-5, *Alternative to Redlining*. He explained that the document was the result of a compromise after lengthy discussions of potential alternatives to redlining. During the course of deliberations in the Educational Policy Committee, it became apparent that two strongly held positions existed among the members; (1) all grades should be included in calculating the GPA until a grade is replaced by a new grade for the same course, and (2) some form of a “freshman forgiveness policy” should exist that enables students to overcome poor grades they earn while adjusting to the University.

Professor Bodner answered several questions from Senators to clarify the intent of the Educational Policy Committee in devising this document. Professor Bodner implored his fellow Senators to send suggestions for improvement of the document to him prior to the next meeting of the Educational Policy Committee so that any changes could be included when the document is presented for action at the next Senate meeting. The view of the Senate was that the Educational Policy Committee did a very good job given the complexity of the issue of grade adjustment. The consensus of the Senate was that the Educational Policy Committee should consider two additional items; (1) the special situation in Engineering relative to when a student declares a major, and (2) a means to include part-time students in an equitable manner.

The final comments were provided by Registrar Kubat who suggested that Purdue University implement a degree audit system that would eliminate the need for an alternative to redlining by its very nature. This type of system will be possible in the SAP software that will be brought on-line as part of the OnePurdue project. Professor Bodner addressed this by bringing to light problems that Purdue University professors and administrators have encountered with such a system in the past. At this point, Professor Skvarenina brought an end to the discussion.

9. Professor Mark Morgan presented, for discussion, University Senate Document 05-6, *Changes to University Grade Appeals System*. Professor Morgan explained that Provost Mason had appointed a task force to review the existing grade appeals system. The task force made several recommendations designed to streamline the process and ensure that grade appeals are considered in a timely fashion. One recommendation was to reduce the number of members on the appeals committee to assure that it can be assembled quickly to consider the student's appeal. In addition, there is a provision to have an assistant or associate dean from each school/college serve as the permanent chair (without vote) of the school/college grade appeals committee. One of the advantages of this is to allow an "institutional memory" for the grade appeals committee. A brief discussion followed Professor Morgan's presentation. This document will be presented for action at the February Senate meeting.
10. There was no new business.
11. There were no memorial resolutions.
12. The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT MARTIN C. JISCHKE

Thank you very much! Good afternoon and welcome back to what we optimistically call the beginning of the spring semester here at Purdue. I know classes are well underway and I suspect all of you are quite busy. As always we have a great deal planned for the next several months as we continue to make substantial progress on both our Strategic Plans and the Campaign for Purdue. You have a rather full agenda today so I will keep my remarks somewhat brief, and I have a commitment at 3:30 in another place, so if I leave a bit early it is not an editorial comment on the discussion that is going on at that moment. It is because I have another appointment.

Today I am going to use my time to talk about a topic that has attracted a great deal of attention throughout the country over the past several years, and it is the subject of international student enrollments. I have been in Washington D.C. several times during the past 15 months to discuss this subject. In the fall of 2004, I had the opportunity to address the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Last fall I spoke on this topic with a group of U.S. Senators under the auspices of the senate majority leader. International enrollment was also discussed in early December when I took part in the National Summit on Competitiveness at the U.S. Department of Commerce. And at the beginning of this month I participated in the University Presidents' Summit on International Education at the United States Department of State. Among the people we met with at this summit were:

- Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice,
- Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings,
- the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs Karen Hughes and
- President Bush.

And I will tell you that the meetings were very positive. The President was quite passionate and persuasive expressing his personal view and the view of the country that international students were quite welcome here in the United States and we would like to see more of them. Overall I was rather impressed with the support of the entire administration on this issue. I believe they are pledged to work with us and I believe we are actually seeing some progress in areas such as visa issues and the teaching of critical languages.

I think we are all well aware that after several years of steady growth, international enrollment in the United States has been in decline since 2002. The good news is the decline is slowing and we are optimistic that a more recent trend that we are now seeing will continue to improve the numbers. Nationwide, international enrollment dropped 2.4 percent two years ago and slowed to a decline of 1.3 percent last year. We have seen similar numbers and declines here at Purdue. Our international graduate and undergraduate enrollment hit an all time high of 5,094 in 2003 and dropped to 4,921 in the fall of 2004. That is about a 3 percent drop. This year our total international enrollment dropped again to 4,831. But we do seem to have turned the corner in terms of undergraduate international enrollment. This year we have a record number of international freshmen enrolled here at Purdue — 401. The total of new undergraduate international students is very close to being a record. Even though we had a slight decline in the total number of international undergraduates, we see evidence that we're back on track to maintain or slightly increase our numbers for next fall. International undergraduate applications and admittance are running ahead of this time last year. That's a good sign. At the graduate level, we continue to see a decline in the number of applications and therefore the number of admissions. This academic year, in total international enrollment, the University of Illinois and

Purdue are first and second respectively among public universities in the nation. Only the University of Southern California has a larger international enrollment than Illinois and Purdue. So we rank third among all universities.

This year our international students represent 12.5 percent of our student body. One out of every eight students is an international student. They comprise three out of eight, 37.5 percent of our graduate and professional enrollment. The largest number of international students, it will not surprise you, is in Engineering, just under 48 percent of that enrollment; in Science it is just under 16 percent; Management, a little over 12; Liberal Arts, a little over 8; and Agriculture just under 7. The largest number of international students comes to us from India, 1,020 students. China is second at 782 and South Korea third at 680. A statistic I have been using that gathers the attention of audiences is to note that 30 percent of our faculty were born in another country of the world. We are quite dependent on international talent to populate our faculty and if you restrict that to the Engineering and Science faculty, it is 47.9 percent. Almost half of the faculty in Engineering and Science come to us from another country of the world. We have been recruiting international undergraduate students for a decade at Purdue and in fact intensified that. We have new initiatives underway to help us recruit more international graduate students. Among these are departmental trips to recruit these students. Four of these are planned for this semester, including visits to several Asian nations, Russia and the Baltic States.

Among the reasons for this decline in the number of international students is the enormous competition we face for talented international students, particularly from Great Britain, Australia, Canada and New Zealand. I have been to India and China over the past year and I must tell you I am quite impressed with the significant advances that are taking place in those countries in the quality of their universities. Not only are they improving their physical facilities and their standards for quality, especially in research, the result is they are doing a better job of keeping more of their own students and they are attracting students from other countries of the world and not just in Asia. I was rather startled when I was walking the campus of Tsinghua in early September in Beijing to run into a group of German students who were studying at the graduate level there in China. The nations that have historically sent us the largest number of international students are now competing, as much as we do, to bring the best in the world to their universities. It is an interesting form of flattery, imitation, but it also represents competition. Clearly we are going to have to work harder in order to maintain our leadership and our ability to attract and retain this talent. And this also includes working on such practical issues as finances, visas and subsequent job opportunities.

I believe very strongly that international education holds enormous promise in fulfilling our greatest hopes for this new century in our university. International educational exchange promotes understanding and friendships. When we provide an opportunity for the world's best and brightest to study in America, we give them a chance to understand our values and our way of life. And then they return home to assume leadership positions in their country — we have two foreign ministers, one in Jordan and one in Taiwan, that are graduates of Purdue. Interestingly one's an electrical engineer and the other is an atmospheric scientist. I take that as a compliment that a good education allows you to do a number of things including being a foreign minister. Students from other parts of the world who come to our campus are exposed to our nation and to our people. They come to understand our culture and society better, and the talent that they have means when they go back home they almost, of necessity, end up in leadership positions and they can make a difference. I am one of those that think U.S. relations around the world in the next 50 years are really being nurtured at campuses like Purdue today.

I think our own students, faculty, and staff also benefit enormously from these interactions with a variety of backgrounds and cultures. It opens the door to the world for our students. It's a door of understanding. Clearly in the years ahead, our own students from Indiana and other parts of the United States, are going to be in a global economy and they will work in an increasingly globalized world. They will need to be able to interact effectively with people from a wide variety of cultures and customs. International enrollment in this regard really helps prepare our students for their future. It also helps to break down stereotypes and misinformation that are the breeding grounds of intolerance.

International education is not only important to our nation; I think it's very important to the worldwide community. At the same time we are working to bring international students here to the United States and to Purdue in particular, we are also working to send more of our own students on international experiences — send them abroad. Participation in Study Abroad has increased over the last two years by 48 percent, and we now have over a 1,000 students. Last year it was 1,027 students. We expect to hit that 1,000 or more mark again this year. Last year, students in study abroad were involved in 170 different programs in 47 different countries. All of you play a role in promoting this and I thank you for that help. I hope you and your colleagues, everyone, will continue to encourage our students to participate in study abroad opportunities. I believe it's part of a first class education. It's surely at the center of developing the kind of critical thinking skills that are the mark of an educated person; the ability to see things from the perspective of others is at the heart of critical thinking. And one way to do that is get outside of this country to gain that other perspective not only from others but from looking back here at the home country to learn.

I hope we continue making Purdue a world-class experience for not only our domestic students that come to Purdue but also international students who come here from around the world. To all of you a thank you. I would be happy to respond to any questions if anybody has any for me about this topic.

REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE - PROFESSOR TIMOTHY L. SKVARENINA

Good afternoon, I'll try to keep my comments brief today, as I expect we will again have significant discussions on the later agenda items.

The Board of Trustees met on December 17th. The Trustees' December meeting is held on Saturday, the day before commencement and traditionally the agenda is shortened. Thus, my report, as well as those from the students and other campuses, was omitted. The Board ratified Dr. Paul Robinson as the School of Veterinary Medicine Professor of Cytomics. Paul is a Senator, so please congratulate him. The Board named several new and proposed facilities and programs and received Governance reports from Provost Sally Mason concerning Academic Program Review/Accreditation and from Vice-President Tom Robinson concerning Student Financial Aid. Just to mention a few highlights. Sally reported there were 27 reviews conducted last year and 40 are scheduled this year. She also discussed a program review that was done in Mechanical Engineering that went beyond their usual accreditation review. Tom Robinson reported that student aid continues to grow and now is over \$0.5 B, although $\frac{3}{4}$ of that is in the form of loans and employment. Some 77% of our undergraduate students receive some form of aid. Aid has kept up with tuition increases for the lowest income segments. As usual, the presentations are available at the Board of Trustees website (<http://www.purdue.edu/bot>) and are very interesting.

As I mentioned at our last meeting, I told the Board of Trustees about the proposed elimination of redlining at their November meeting, which was before our last meeting. The Trustees were very interested in the issue and asked about grade inflation. Some of you no doubt noticed the article in the Exponent this morning, which indicated the all-campus GPA last year was 2.83. Jacque Frost, Director of the Office of Institutional Research, was kind enough to send me plot of the Average UG Grade index by fall semester for the past 48 years (1957 through 2004). In 1957, the GPA was 2.18 (adjusted to the current 4.0 scale), but it rose steadily in the late 50's, through the 60's and early 70's, peaking at 2.83 or 2.84 from 1972 to 1975. It then declined slightly to a low of 2.65 in 1984. Since then, it has drifted up to a peak of 2.87 in 2002, followed by 2.86 in 2003, and 2.83 in 2004. As a result, the GPA is essentially the same as it was 30 years ago. I will inform the trustees of this, as well as our actions concerning the redlining issue at their February meeting.

Also at our last meeting, I told you about the survey of the faculty concerning pay frequency. In all, there were 424 responses, of which 117 preferred nine checks, 270 preferred the 10 check option (in which the first and last would be partial months pay), and 37 gave no response. Of the 424, 49% offered comments. 102 individuals indicated a desire for having their salary spread over 12 months, and that is being investigated. As you can imagine, there were a variety of comments; some want no change to the current system and a few seemed to think they were going to lose a month's pay under either of the new proposals.

I would be happy to answer any questions.

TO: University Senate
FROM: Herbert L. Weith, Chairperson, Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Resume of Items Under Consideration by the Various Standing Committees

STEERING COMMITTEE

Herbert L. Weith, Chairperson
weith@purdue.edu

The primary responsibility of the Steering Committee is the organization and distribution of the agenda for each meeting of the University Senate. This committee also receives communications from any faculty member or group of members and directs such communications to appropriate committees or officers for attention.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Timothy L. Skvarenina, Chairperson of the Senate
tskvaren@purdue.edu

The responsibility of the University Senate Advisory Committee is to advise the President and/or Board of Trustees on any matter of concern to the faculty.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Charles E. Kline, Chairperson
chuck@purdue.edu

The Nominating Committee is responsible for presenting nominations for the University Senate and University committees. In filling committee vacancies the Nominating Committee seeks to have all interested Senators serve on at least one committee.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

George M. Bodner, Chairperson
gmbodner@purdue.edu

1. Transfer credit
2. Distance learning courses
3. Evaluation of the University Honors Program
4. Redlining Policy

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mark T. Morgan, Chairperson
mmorgan@purdue.edu

1. Grade Appeals Process
2. Committee on Informetrics
3. Follow-up on faculty development review
4. Tenure Promotion Process

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

April J. Ginther, Chairperson
aginther@purdue.edu

1. Follow-up on the Academic Integrity Assessment Project and "Integrity counts" video

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE

Morris Levy, Chairperson
levy0@purdue.edu

1. Faculty input into the budget process: Graduate staff fee structure & the Strategic plan
2. Review of campus way-finding and signage plans and campus energy sufficiency
3. Review of Faculty Committees

Vice Chair of the Senate, Bernard Y. Tao, tao@purdue.edu
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr., jcamp@purdue.edu
University Senate Minutes; <http://www.purdue.edu/usenate>

CALENDAR OF STATUS OF LEGISLATION
--

<i>SENATE DOCUMENT</i>	<i>TITLE</i>	<i>ORIGIN</i>	<i>SENATE</i>
*05-1	Nominees for University Senate Standing Committees	University Senate Nominating Committee	Approved 10/17/05
*05-2	Proposed Change to the University Senate Bylaws	Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina	Approved 10/17/05
*05-3	Proposed Change to University Regulations	University Senate Educational Policy Committee	Approved as Amended 11/21/05
*05-4	Reapportionment of the University Senate	Professor Herbert L. Weith	Approved 11/21/05
05-5	Alternative to Redlining	University Senate Educational Policy Committee	For Discussion 1/23/06
05-6	Changes to University Grade Appeals System	Faculty Affairs Committee	For Discussion 1/23/06

***Approved**

TO: The University Senate
FROM: University Senate Educational Policy Committee
SUBJECT: Alternative to Redlining
DISPOSITION: University Senate for Discussion
REFERENCES: University Regulations 2004-05, Section II, Academic Program,
Part J

Introduction

At the 21 November 2005 University Senate meeting, the following amendment was added to Senate Document 05-3.

The Senate approves the Elimination of Redlining with the proviso that it will not go into effect until the Educational Policy Committee proposes a policy of student forgiveness that is adopted by the Faculty Senate. The Senate directs the Educational Policy Committee to design such a policy immediately.

As noted in Senate Document 05-3, the term “redlining” came from the practice of crossing out the deleted courses with red ink on the form that was sent to the Registrar’s Office when students completed the Change of Degree Objective (CODO) process by which they transferred from one School or College to another. The official term for this process is “index adjustment.”

Two well-articulated and deep-felt positions became obvious during discussions of index adjustment: (1) All grades should be included in the calculation of the GPA until or unless a grade was replaced by a new grade for the same course, and (2) some form of a “freshman forgiveness policy” should exist that enables students to overcome poor grades they might receive while adjusting to the University.

In the spirit of compromise, the Educational Policy Committee proposes an approach to the calculation of a student’s GPA that might satisfy those who believe that a grade should remain on a student’s record. At the same time, it might satisfy those who believe in some form of forgiveness policy. It decouples grade adjustment from the CODO process; it minimizes the number of ways in which the grade adjustment system can be abused by students; and it minimizes differences in the way in which Schools or Colleges can implement the grade adjustment policy.

As it now stands, there are two scholastic indexes — a **semester index** and a **cumulative index**. The compromise we propose is based on the creation of a third scholastic index, which will be known as the **graduation index**. Grade adjustments will be applied only to the graduation index, not the cumulative or semester index.

The cumulative index will be used for all external reporting functions. It is the index to be used, for example, to report athletes grades to the NCAA; to report a student’s grades to external scholarship committees; for financial aid decisions; to report on the students’

progress to the Veterans Administration; and so on. As long as the legacy system is used, which can only report one summative index, the cumulative index would be the one reported on the student's official transcripts.

The graduation index would be used for all internal functions. Rather than trying to recalibrate the myriad places within the University where GPA indices based on our old redlining policy have been used, the graduation index (with its inherent student forgiveness policy) would be used. The graduation index would therefore be used to determine whether a student is placed on probation; whether a student is dropped from the University; whether the student would be allowed into a different program; whether a student would be allowed to move from one School or College to another; whether a student on academic drop status would be readmitted; to determine distinguished list status; and so on.

The EPC proposes that the following restrictions be placed on adjustments to the graduation index.

- X Grade adjustments can be implemented only by an authorized representative of the academic unit in which the student is registered or in which a student will be registering, in consultation with the student.
- X Grade adjustments can be applied to no more than three courses totaling no more than 12 credit hours.
- X Grade adjustments can be applied only to courses completed during the first 12 months of the student's enrollment as a degree-seeking student.
- X There will be no difference between the way this policy applies to full-time, part-time, or transfer students.
- X Courses removed from the calculation of the graduation index must be those that cannot be used toward graduation in the curriculum in which the student is registered or the curriculum in which the student will be registering.
- X The courses must be removed within the first 24 months of the student's enrollment as a degree-seeking student.
- X The process of grade adjustment is not reversible.
- X Courses removed from the calculation of the graduation index cannot be used to fulfill any requirements for graduation.

This proposal enables students to remove from the graduation index courses that are not required for graduation. It also allows the authorized representatives of the academic unit to remove courses that cannot be applied toward graduation.

PROPOSED CHANGE TO UNIVERSITY REGULATIONS 2005-06

Part 2 Academic Regulations and Procedures, Section VII Grades and Grade Reports, Subheading J. Scholastic Indexes, Academic Procedures Manual (Page O-29)

Present	Proposed
<p>J. Scholastic Indexes*</p> <p>The scholastic standing of all students enrolled in programs leading to a degree shall be determined by two scholastic indexes: the semester index and the cumulative index.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The semester index is an average determined by weighting each grade received during a given academic session by the number of semester hours of credit in the course. 2. The cumulative index for an undergraduate student is a weighted average of all grades received as an undergraduate student. With the consent of his/her academic adviser, a student may repeat a course not intended for repeated registrations. In the case of such a repeated course, only the most recent grade received shall be included in the cumulative index. In the case of a course in which a conditional grade has been improved by examination the most recent grade received shall be used. 	<p>J. Scholastic Indexes*</p> <p>The scholastic standing of all students enrolled in programs leading to a degree shall be determined by three scholastic indexes: the semester index, the cumulative index, and the graduation index.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The semester index is an average determined by weighting each grade received during a given academic session by the number of semester hours of credit in the course. 2. The cumulative index for an undergraduate student is a weighted average of all grades received as an undergraduate student. With the consent of his/her academic adviser, a student may repeat a course not intended for repeated registrations. In the case of such a repeated course, only the most recent grade received shall be included in the cumulative index. In the case of a course in which a conditional grade has been improved by examination the most recent grade received shall be used. The cumulative index will be used by the University for reporting to external agencies. 3. The graduation index will be a modified form of the cumulative index and will be used by the University for all internal purposes. An authorized representative of the academic unit in which the student is registered or in which the student will be registered may approve the removal of no more than three courses totaling no more than 12 credit hours from the calculation of the graduation index under the following conditions: (1) the courses were completed during the first 12 months of the student's enrollment as a full-time or part-time degree-seeking student, (2) the courses are not required for the curriculum in which the student is enrolled, and (3) the courses are removed within the first 24 months of the student's enrollment as a full-time or part-time degree-seeking student. The process of grade adjustment is not reversible. Courses that have been removed from the calculation of the graduation index can not be used to fulfill any requirements for graduation.

Approved:

Kristine Anderson
Behnam Ben Arjomandi
Ann Astell
Carol Baird
George Bodner, Chair
Dennis Bowling
Patrick Connolly
Scott Feld
Jim Greenan
L. Tony Hawkins
Christine Ladisch
Andrew Luescher
James D. McGlothlin
Robert Montgomery
Mark Moriarty
Hisao Nakanishi
Richard Penney
Mike Talbott
Robert Waterson

Not Approving:

Layi Adeola
Robert Kubat

To: The University Senate
From: Faculty Affairs Committee - Mark Morgan, Chair
Subject: Changes to University Grade Appeals System
Reference: University Regulations 2005-06, Part 5, Section III, E. Grade Appeals System
Disposition: University Senate for Discussion

Introduction

Last spring, Provost Mason appointed a task force to review the existing grade appeals system and to recommend changes to the system. That task force included Associate Dean Stephen Akers, Drs. George Bodner, Anne Knupfer, Wallace Morrison, Charlene Sullivan, Candiss Vibbert, William Zinsmeister, Mr. Jonathan Hoggatt, and Margaret Moan Rowe (chair).

The recommendations from that task force were revised and approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee on October 3, 2005.

EXISTING

E. Grade Appeals System

1. Adoption by Faculty. The faculty of the University at the West Lafayette Campus has adopted the following procedures for grade appeals pursuant to the authority delegated to the faculty. The Board of Trustees hereby approves such procedures for the West Lafayette Campus.

2. General.

a. In the academic community, grades are a measure of student achievement toward fulfillment of course objectives. The responsibility for assessing student achievement and assigning grades rests with the faculty, and, except for unusual circumstances, the course grade given is final.

b. The grade appeals system affords recourse to a student who has evidence or believes that evidence exists to show that an inappropriate grade has been assigned as a result of prejudice, caprice, or other improper conditions such as mechanical error, or assignment of a grade inconsistent with those assigned other students. Additionally, a student may challenge the reduction of a grade for alleged scholastic dishonesty.

PROPOSED

E. Grade Appeals System

1. Adoption by Faculty. The faculty of the University at the West Lafayette Campus has adopted the following procedures for grade appeals pursuant to the authority delegated to the faculty. The Board of Trustees hereby approves such procedures for the West Lafayette Campus.

2. General.

a. In the academic community, grades are a measure of student achievement toward fulfillment of course objectives. The responsibility for assessing student achievement and assigning grades rests with the faculty, and, except for unusual circumstances, the course grade given is final.

b. The grade appeals system affords recourse to a student who has evidence or believes that evidence exists to show that an inappropriate grade has been assigned as a result of prejudice, caprice, or other improper conditions such as mechanical error, or assignment of a grade inconsistent with those assigned other students. Additionally, a student may challenge the reduction of a grade for alleged scholastic dishonesty.

c. The only University authorities empowered to change grades are the instructor or, in the case of teaching assistants, the faculty member in charge of the course in question and the chairman/chairwoman of the University Grade Appeals Committee acting in behalf of the school and University grade appeals committees.

d. Informal attempts must be made to resolve grade grievances and appeals at the lowest possible level — through the course instructor, through the department head, or through other informal procedures outlined by the school and/or department in which the course was taught.

e. Graduate students who wish to appeal grades received in regular coursework may do so through the grade appeals system. Cases involving the decisions of graduate examination committees, the acceptance of graduate theses, and the application of professional standards relating to the retention of graduate students shall be handled by procedures authorized by the Graduate Council rather than the grade appeals system.

f. When a student initiates a formal grade appeal, he/she should be prepared to state in what way his/her grade assignment was arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise improper. At that time, he/she may seek the assistance of the dean of students, the chairperson of one of the grade appeals committees, or his/her academic advisor.

g. In appealing a grade, the burden of proof is on the student, except in the case of alleged academic dishonesty, where the instructor must support the allegation.

3. School Grade Appeals Committees.

a. Each of the 10 schools of Purdue University at the West Lafayette Campus shall establish a Grade Appeals Committee to hear grade grievances and appeals that are not resolved informally at a lower level. In cases of alleged academic dishonesty, the school committee shall consist of two undergraduate students, two graduate students (except in schools that have no graduate students, in which case the graduates

c. The only University authorities empowered to change grades are the instructor or, in the case of teaching assistants, the faculty member in charge of the course in question and the chairman/chairwoman of the University Grade Appeals Committee acting in behalf of the school and University grade appeals committees.

d. Informal attempts must be made to resolve grade grievances and appeals at the lowest possible level — through the course instructor, through the department head, or through other informal procedures outlined by the **college/school** and/or department in which the course was taught.

e. Graduate students who wish to appeal grades received in regular coursework may do so through the grade appeals system. Cases involving the decisions of graduate examination committees, the acceptance of graduate theses, and the application of professional standards relating to the retention of graduate students shall be handled by procedures authorized by the Graduate Council rather than the grade appeals system.

f. When a student initiates a formal grade appeal, he/she should be prepared to state in what way his/her grade assignment was arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise improper. At that time, he/she may seek the assistance of the dean of students, the chairperson of one of the grade appeals committees, or his/her academic advisor.

g. In appealing a grade, the burden of proof is on the student, except in the case of alleged academic dishonesty, where the instructor must support the allegation.

3. College/School Grade Appeals Committees.

a. Each of the colleges/schools of Purdue University at the West Lafayette Campus will establish a Grade Appeals Committee to hear grade grievances and appeals that are not resolved informally at a lower level. Each committee will consist of two students (undergraduate or graduate corresponding to the status of the appellant), three members of the instructional faculty, and a non-voting

will be replaced by a like number of undergraduates), and four members of the instructional faculty; in all other cases, the committee shall consist of two students (undergraduate or graduate corresponding to the status of the appellant) and four members of the instructional faculty. An addition, there will be alternates from each (faculty, graduate, and undergraduate) category. The number of alternates selected by each school may vary depending upon anticipated school needs. Each school shall establish procedures whereby the student members and alternates shall be selected annually by the appropriate segment (undergraduate or graduate) of the student body of that unit. Two of the faculty members of the committee shall be selected annually for a two-year term, by vote of the faculty of the school involved, with alternates being selected at the same time for a like term. From the panel of alternates, the chairperson of the respective school committee shall select at random the particular alternates to serve as temporary or permanent replacements for regular members as may be necessary because of absence, personal involvement in the case, potential conflicts of interest, or other specific disqualifying causes.

b. The regular members and alternates shall be selected in the spring (not later than May 1) to commence serving June 1. No member shall serve more than two consecutive terms. Annually, at the last meeting of the academic year, the eight members for the coming year plus all retiring committee members shall elect (by majority vote) one of the four regular faculty members to act as the new chairperson of the committee.

4. University Grade Appeals Committee.

a. A University Grade Appeals Committee, with the authority to hear appeals of school committee decisions, shall be established for the West Lafayette Campus. The University committee shall be responsible to and report to the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Senate. In hearing appeals from cases of alleged academic dishonesty, the University committee shall consist of three undergraduate students, three

chairperson. The chairperson of the committee will be an assistant or associate dean of the college/school appointed by the dean. The chairperson will be responsible for assuring adherence to established procedures, convening members for an appeal, and maintaining records. The chairperson has the authority to grant warranted time extension in the appeals process described below.

b. *Voting members of the committee will be selected from a pool of at least **eight** students and **eight** instructional faculty. The pool of members of the committee will be selected **according to school/college procedures** in the spring (not later than May 1) to commence serving on **the first day of the following fall semester**. No member shall serve more than two consecutive terms in the pool.*

4. University Grade Appeals Committee.

a. A University Grade Appeals Committee, with the authority to hear appeals of school committee decisions, shall be established for the West Lafayette Campus. The University committee shall be responsible to and report to the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Senate. ***In all appeal cases***, the committee shall consist of ***two students*** (undergraduate or graduate to correspond to the status of the appealing student)

graduate students, and six members of the instructional faculty, in all other appeal cases, the committee shall consist of three students (undergraduate or graduate to correspond to the status of the appealing student) and six members of the instructional faculty. They shall be selected in the following manner: six undergraduate students nominated by the student body president and confirmed by the Student Senate; three graduate students appointed by the Committee on Student Affairs of the University Senate; and nine faculty members selected by the University Senate. The student members shall be appointed annually. Three of the faculty members of the committee shall be elected annually for a three-year term.

b. The members shall be selected in the spring (not later than May 1) to start serving June 1. No member shall serve more than two consecutive terms. If any appointing authority fails to make the initial appointments to the University Grade Appeals Committee within the specified time, or to fill any vacancy on the panel of members within five days after being notified to do so by the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee, or if at any time the University Grade Appeals Committee cannot function because of refusal of any member to serve, the chairperson of the Faculty Affairs Committee may make appointments, fill vacancies, or take such other actions as he/she deems necessary to constitute a University Grade Appeals Committee.

c. Annually, at the last University Grade Appeals Committee meeting of the academic year, the 18 members for the coming year plus all retiring committee members shall elect (by majority vote) one of the six regular faculty members to act as the new chairperson of the committee.

d. The University Grade Appeals Committee shall adopt its own hearing proceedings, and establish uniform procedures to be followed by the school committees. The chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee shall be responsible for insuring that all school grade appeals committees are properly constituted and functional.

and **four** members of the instructional faculty. They shall be selected in the following manner: **four** undergraduate students nominated by the student body president and confirmed by the Student Senate; **four** graduate students appointed by the Committee on Student Affairs of the University Senate; and **eight** faculty members selected by the University Senate. The student members shall be appointed annually. **Two** of the faculty members of the committee shall be elected annually for a three-year term. -

b. The members shall be selected in the spring (not later than May 1) to start serving **on the first day of the following fall semester**. No member shall serve more than two consecutive terms. If any appointing authority fails to make the initial appointments to the University Grade Appeals Committee within the specified time, or to fill any vacancy on the panel of members within five days after being notified to do so by the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee, or if at any time the University Grade Appeals Committee cannot function because of refusal of any member to serve, the chairperson of the Faculty Affairs Committee may make appointments, fill vacancies, or take such other actions as he/she deems necessary to constitute a University Grade Appeals Committee.

c. Annually, at the last University Grade Appeals Committee meeting of the academic year, **the members** for the coming year plus all retiring committee members shall elect (by majority vote) one of the **eight** regular faculty members to act as the new **non-voting** chairperson of the committee.

d. The University Grade Appeals Committee shall adopt its own hearing proceedings, and establish uniform procedures to be followed by the **college/school** committees. The chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee shall be responsible for insuring that all school grade appeals committees are properly constituted and functional.

5. Initiating a Grade Appeal.

a. A student who wishes to appeal a grade must file a notice of intention to appeal with the chairperson of the Grade Appeals Committee of the school in which the course was taken. This must be done within 30 days after the start of the regular semester following the one in which the questioned grade was given. The student will then have a maximum of 30 days (from the date of the notice) to attempt to resolve the situation with the instructor, department head, etc. If a mutually acceptable decision is not reached, the student must return (within the 30-day limit) to the respective school committee chairperson with a detailed written statement of allegations, facts, and circumstances. When it appears necessary to avoid undue hardship or to avoid injustice, the school committee chairperson may extend the time limitation.

b. After receipt of the student's detailed statement, the chairperson shall promptly give notice of the hearing to the involved faculty member with the time, date, and place of the hearing (which shall be held not less than five and, whenever practicable, not more than 10 days after the receipt of such notice). Written notice shall be accompanied by a copy of the student's detailed statement, as well as the procedures and sequence of events to be followed in conducting the hearing.

The involved faculty member may request the school grade appeals committee to review the student's allegations and rule if the allegations concern issues within the jurisdiction of the committee. If any member of the committee finds cause for a grade appeal, a hearing shall be held; otherwise, the student's appeal shall be denied. Within six class days of receipt of the committee decision the student may file a written notice of intent to request further appeal with the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee.

5. Initiating a Grade Appeal.

a. *Prior to initiating a grade appeal, the student is strongly encouraged to resolve the situation with the instructor, department head, or head's designee. The department head is strongly encouraged to facilitate an informal resolution process between the parties.*

b. Appeal Process.

(1) A student who wishes to initiate a grade appeal must file a written statement of allegations, facts, and circumstances concerning the grade assigned with the chairperson of the Grade Appeals Committee of the college/school in which the course was taken. This must be done within 30 calendar days after the start of the regular semester following the one in which the questioned grade was given.

(2) After receipt of the student's written statement, the chairperson will promptly furnish a copy of the statement to the involved instructor who has seven days to make a written response. The chairperson will submit the statement of appeal and any responses to each of the members of the college/school grade appeals committee. Committee members will review the written documents within seven calendar days from the date they are received. If one voting member of the committee rules that the allegations warrant a hearing or are best addressed through a hearing, a hearing will be held; otherwise, the appeal will be denied. With reasonable cause, the chairperson may override the decision not to hear the case.

(3) If the appeal is to be heard, the chairperson will promptly give notice of the time, date, and place of the hearing to the parties involved. The hearing will be scheduled not more than 14 calendar days after notice to the student and instructor.

c. The faculty member shall promptly make all pertinent grading records available to the school committee chairperson. In advance of the hearing, the chairperson may at his/her discretion make available to the student those records (or portions thereof) that he/she judges to be relevant in light of the student's allegations.

6. Conduct of School Grade Appeals Committee Hearing, General.

a. The hearing shall be closed, unless both parties agree in writing that it be open. This chairperson's determination of the hearing location and the number of individuals that can be conveniently accommodated shall be final. The student and the instructor are both entitled to be represented at the hearing by advisors of their choice. Because the hearings are administrative and not judicial in nature, the advisors may not be lawyers. Both parties (or their representatives) have the right to present evidence and witnesses in their behalf and to confront and question opposing witnesses.

b. Under normal circumstances, if the duly notified student complainant does not appear for the hearing the complaint shall be dismissed, the case closed, and these actions not subject to further hearing or appeal. If, however, a duly notified faculty member does not appear, the hearing will continue on the presumption that there is no desire to challenge evidence or witnesses presented by the student.

(4) The *instructor* will promptly make all pertinent grading records available to the *college/school* committee's chairperson. In advance of the hearing, the chairperson may at his/her discretion make available to the student those records (or portions thereof) that he/she judges to be relevant in light of the student's allegations.

6. Conduct of College/School Grade Appeals Committee Hearing, General.

a. The hearing shall be closed, unless both parties agree in writing that it be open. The chairperson's determination of the hearing location and the number of individuals that can be conveniently accommodated shall be final. The student and the instructor are both entitled to be *accompanied* at the hearing by advisors of their choice. Because the hearings are administrative and not judicial in nature, the advisors may not be lawyers. Both parties have the right to present evidence and witnesses in their behalf and to confront and question opposing witnesses.

b. Under normal circumstances, if the duly notified student complainant does not appear for the hearing the complaint shall be dismissed, the case closed, and these actions not subject to further hearing or appeal. If, however, a duly notified faculty member does not appear, the hearing will continue on the presumption that there is no desire to challenge evidence or witnesses presented by the student.

c. An official tape recording shall be made of each hearing and filed by the chairperson of the respective school committee for at least one year. The recording will be confidential and used only if further appeal is granted by the University Grade Appeals Committee or under legal compulsion.

d. At the conclusion of the hearing, the committee may (by a majority vote of the committee membership) recommend changing the original grade. A written report of the committee's decision shall be sent to both parties and the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee no later than 15 days after the conclusion of the hearing. Either party may, within six class days of receipt of the decision, file a written notice of intent to request further appeal with the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee. If no such notice is received by the chairperson within the six-day period, the decision shall not be subject to further hearing appeal. If, at that time, the instructor who originally gave the grade is not willing to initiate a recommended change, the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee shall file the directed change with the registrar who shall record the new grade.

7. Appeal of a School Committee Decision.

a. Under certain specific circumstances (Sec III-E-7-b) either the student or the instructor may file a request for an appeal of the school grade appeals committee decision. If the appeal request is granted, the case will be heard by the University Grade Appeals Committee. The process may be initiated by filing a personally signed notice of appeal with the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee within the six-day limit (Section III-E-6-d). The notice

c. An official *audio* recording shall be made of each hearing and filed by the chairperson of the respective *college/school* committee for at least one year. The recording will be confidential and used only if further appeal is granted by the University Grade Appeals Committee or under legal compulsion.

d. At the conclusion of the hearing, the committee may (by a majority vote of the committee membership) recommend changing the original grade. A written report of the committee's decision shall be sent to both parties and the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee no later than *three* days after the conclusion of the hearing. Either party may, within six class days of receipt of the decision, file a written notice of intent to request further appeal with the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee. If no such notice is received by the chairperson within the six-day period, the decision shall not be subject to further hearing appeal. If, at that time, the instructor who originally gave the grade is not willing to initiate a recommended change, the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee shall file the directed change with the registrar who shall record the new grade.

e. The chairperson of each college/school committee will maintain a written record of all grade appeals heard in the college/school and provide an annual overview of the grade appeals process to the Provost

7. Appeal of a College/School Committee Decision.

a. Under certain specific circumstances (Sec III-E-7-b) either the student or the instructor may file a request for an appeal of the *college/school* grade appeals committee decision. If the appeal request is granted, the case will be heard by the University Grade Appeals Committee. The process may be initiated by filing a personally signed notice of appeal with the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee within the six-day limit (Section III-E-6-d). The notice

shall be accompanied by a written statement of the alleged procedural irregularities or new evidence, or a substantial enumeration of why the appellant believes the school committee decision is erroneous or unfair. Upon request, the respective school committee chairperson immediately will transmit the tape recording of the school hearing and any other items of evidence presented at the school hearing to the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee. The decision of the University Grade Appeals Committee to grant or deny appeals from school committees shall be final.

b. If the University Grade Appeals Committee finds, on the basis of the appellant's written statement and other available evidence, that substantial procedural irregularities or inequities existed in the school hearing or that substantial new evidence has been uncovered, the University Grade Appeals Committee shall hear the case de novo. Additionally, the committee may, at its discretion, hear appeals from the school level, when the appellant's statement substantiates to its satisfaction that the school decision may have been erroneous or unfair. If the University Grade Appeals Committee grants an appeal, the chairperson shall promptly give notice to both parties of the time, date, and place of hearing (which shall be held not less than five and, whenever practicable, not more than 10 days after the receipt of such notice), as well as providing them with a copy of the procedures and sequence of events to be followed in conducting the hearing.

8. Conduct of University Grade Appeal Committee Hearings, General.

a. The appeal hearing shall be closed, unless both parties agree in writing for it to be open. The chairperson's determination of the hearing location and the number of individuals that can be conveniently accommodated shall be final. The appellant and opposing parties are both entitled to be represented at the hearing by advisors of their choice. Because the hearings are administrative and not judicial in nature, the

shall be accompanied by a written statement of the alleged procedural irregularities or new evidence, or a substantial enumeration of why the appellant believes the *college/school* committee decision is erroneous or unfair. Upon request, the respective *college/school* committee chairperson immediately will transmit the *audio* recording of the *college/school* hearing and any other items of evidence presented at the college/school hearing to the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee. The decision of the University Grade Appeals Committee to grant or deny appeals from school committees shall be final.

b. If the University Grade Appeals Committee finds, on the basis of the appellant's written statement and other available evidence, that substantial procedural irregularities or inequities existed in the *college/school* hearing or that substantial new evidence has been uncovered, the University Grade Appeals Committee shall hear the case de novo. Additionally, the committee may, at its discretion, hear appeals from the *college/school* level, when the appellant's statement substantiates to its satisfaction that the *college/school* decision may have been erroneous or unfair. If the University Grade Appeals Committee grants an appeal, the chairperson shall promptly give notice to both parties of the time, date, and place of hearing (which shall be held not less than five and, whenever practicable, not more than 10 days after the receipt of such notice), as well as providing them with a copy of the procedures and sequence of events to be followed in conducting the hearing.

8. Conduct of University Grade Appeal Committee Hearing, General.

a. The appeal hearing shall be closed, unless both parties agree in writing for it to be open. The chairperson's determination of the hearing location and the number of individuals that can be conveniently accommodated shall be final. The appellant and opposing parties are both entitled to be *accompanied* at the hearing by advisors of their choice. Because the hearings are administrative and not judicial in nature, the

advisors may not be lawyers. If an appeal is heard on the basis of procedural irregularity or new evidence, either parties (or their representatives) have the right to present evidence and witnesses in their behalf and to confront and question opposing witnesses. If, however, the University Grade Appeals Committee elects to hear an appeal on the grounds that the school grade appeals committee's decision appears to be erroneous or unfair, it shall not accept additional evidence but shall consider only matters introduced at the school hearing. The taped record of the school hearing shall be made available for audition by both parties and the members of the University committee. Additionally, the committee may, at its discretion, have a transcript of the school hearing prepared. If a transcript is prepared, it will be safeguarded and used in the same fashion as taped records of hearings.

b. If a duly notified appellant does not appear for the hearing, the committee may close the case and it will be subject to no further hearing or appeal. If the opposing party (having been duly notified) does not appear, the hearing will continue on the presumption that there is no desire to challenge evidence or witnesses that may be presented.

c. An official tape recording shall be made of each hearing and kept by the chairperson of the University committee for at least one year. The tape will be confidential and used only under legal compulsion in civil court proceedings.

d. After the University Grade Appeals Committee hears an appeal, it may (by a majority vote of the committee membership) recommend changing the original grade. A written report of the University Grade Appeals Committee's decision shall be sent to both parties no later than 15 days after the conclusion of the hearing. The University Grade Appeals Committee's decision is final, and shall not be subject to further hearing or appeal. If the instructor who originally gave the grade is not willing to initiate any recommended grade change, the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee shall file the change with the registrar who shall record the new grade.

advisors may not be lawyers. If an appeal is heard on the basis of procedural irregularity or new evidence, both parties have the right to present evidence and witnesses in their behalf and to confront and question opposing witnesses. If, however, the University Grade Appeals Committee elects to hear an appeal on the grounds that the *college/school* grade appeals committee's decision appears to be erroneous or unfair, it shall not accept additional evidence but shall consider only matters introduced at the *college/school* hearing. The *audio* record of the *college/school* hearing shall be made available for audition by both parties and the members of the University committee. Additionally, the committee may, at its discretion, have a transcript of the *college/school* hearing prepared. If a transcript is prepared, it will be safeguarded and used in the same fashion as *audio* records of hearings.

b. If duly notified appellant does not appear for the hearing, the committee may close the case and it will be subject to no further hearing or appeal. If the opposing party (having been duly notified) does not appear, the hearing will continue on the presumption that there is no desire to challenge evidence or witnesses that may be presented.

c. An official *audio* recording shall be made of each hearing and kept by the chairperson of the University committee for at least one year. The *recording* will be confidential and used only under legal compulsion in civil court proceeding

d. After the University Grade Appeals Committee hears an appeal, it may (by a majority vote of the committee membership) recommend changing the original grade. A written report of the University Grade Appeals Committee's decision shall be sent to both parties no later than 15 days after the conclusion of the hearing. If the instructor who originally gave the grade is not willing to initiate any recommended grade change, the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee shall file the change with the registrar who shall record the new grade. The University Grade Appeals Committee's decision is final, and shall not be subject to further hearing or appeal.

9. Other Academic/Grade Appeal Jurisdictions.

a. Informal boards or committees may be established within academic departments to resolve grade grievances and appeals.

b. Students involved in cases of alleged academic dishonesty may be subject to disciplinary penalties under Section III-B-2-a of the Regulations Governing Student Conduct, Disciplinary Proceedings, and Appeals.

Approving:

A Beck
J. Duzinkiewicz
B. Harper
N. Harter
T. Kuczek
V. Killion
S. Mason
D. McMillin
M. Morgan
C. Nakatsu
A. Rollock
C. Sullivan
D. Williams

9. Other Academic/Grade Appeal Jurisdictions.

a. Informal boards or committees may be established within academic departments to resolve grade grievances and appeal.

b. Students involved in cases of alleged academic dishonesty may be subject to disciplinary penalties under Section III-B-2-a of the Regulations Governing Student Conduct, Disciplinary Proceedings, and Appeals.

Absent:

J. Contreni
C.S.G. Lee
Y. Yih