

Request for Action: Academic Standards Committee 08-09
Presidential Response: September 1, 2009

Faculty Senate Academic Standards Committee 2009

Charge One: (A) Drop/Withdrawal Policy

Recommendations:

- ~~1. The withdrawal date should be extended to the end of the 9th week of the semester or, in the case of sessions of shorter length (wintermester, summer session) at the point of 60% into the term. This will provide more time for faculty to provide meaningful feedback regarding grades to students and in some instances, provide students with an opportunity to alter their study strategies in a class and see if such changes result in improved academic performance. Currently, students are allowed to withdraw from individual classes up until the end of the 8th week of the semester. This recommendation is consistent with UNLV's drop date policy.~~
- ~~2. Devise a series of pop-up messages on ePAWS that are initiated when a student attempts to withdraw from a course. The messages would inform the student of possible ramifications if they withdraw from a course (i.e., loss of financial aid and/or scholarships, loss of full-time student status, progress towards degree, etc.) and urge students to consult with an academic advisor prior to withdrawing from individual courses. The committee realizes this may not be feasible with our current registration system, but recommends its implementation as soon as possible.~~

~~MOTION: Jenkins/Hill. To accept the recommendation of the committees Drop/Withdrawal Policy.~~

~~ACTION: Passed, 1 opposed, 1 abstention~~

President's Response: Revised Recommendation Considered in lieu of this recommendation.

Academic Standards Committee Recommendations - Revised

As approved by the Faculty Senate in August 2009

WITHDRAWAL:

1. The withdrawal date should be extended to the end of the 9th week of the semester or, in the case of sessions of shorter length, at a point 60% into the term. A&R says this can be effective Spring 2010, if we get approval soon.
2. Devise a series of pop-up messages on ePAWS that are initiated when a student attempts to withdraw from a course, to inform the student of possible ramifications if they withdraw from a course and urge them to consult with an academic advisor prior to withdrawing from individual courses. This cannot be accommodated until PSFT implementation.

President's Response: Approved with a change from credit to audit in #1 above.

Faculty Senate Academic Standards Committee 2009

Charge One: (B) Grade Replacement Policy

Recommendations:

- ~~1. Extend the number of semesters a student has to repeat a course and use the grade replacement option "the next regular semester in which the course is offered and the student is enrolled" to within the next two regular semesters in which the student is enrolled. If the course is not offered within the next two regular semesters, they must take the course the next time it is offered." Students should still be encouraged to repeat a required class as soon as possible, but this would provide more flexibility in planning and not require students to adjust their next semester schedule if they have already enrolled in classes and/or a class they need to repeat is full.~~
- ~~2. Change the current restriction on the repeat policy to "a maximum of four lower-division courses not to exceed 15 credits." The current policy states that "students may repeat a maximum of 12 lower-division credits to replace original UNR grades." This will assist students who wish to replace the grade in one or more 4 or 5 credit courses.~~

MOTION: Jenkins/Vogel. To approve the recommendation as written.

ACTION: Passed 1 opposed, 1 abstention

President's Response: Revised Recommendation Considered in lieu of this recommendation.

Academic Standards Committee Recommendations - Revised

As approved by the Faculty Senate in August 2009

GRADE REPLACEMENT:

3. Extend the number of semesters a student has to repeat a course and use the grade replacement option from "the next regular semester in which the course is offered and the student is enrolled" to "within the next two regular semesters in which the student is enrolled. If the course is not offered within the next two regular semesters, the student must take the course the next time it is offered."
4. Change the current restriction on the repeat policy from "students may repeat a maximum of 12 lower-division credits to replace original UNR grades" to "a maximum of 15 credits."

President's Response: Approved.

Faculty Senate Academic Standards Committee 2009

Charge One: (C) Probation, Disqualification, Suspension, and Dismissal Policies

Recommendations:

~~The committee's recommendations still result in three level/actions, but terminology and actions taken differ from current policy.~~

- ~~1. Academic Warning: GPA cut offs would continue to be based on the number of credits earned at UNR:
 - ~~i. 0-29 credits — when cumulative UNR GPA is 1.6 or above but below 2.0~~
 - ~~ii. 30-59 credits — when UNR GPA is 1.8 or above but below 2.0~~
 - ~~iii. 60 or more credits — when UNR GPA is 1.9 or above, but below 2.0~~
 - ~~iv. Action:
 - ~~a. Allowed to remain in major~~
 - ~~b. Receives letter from college and email from Admissions and Records~~
 - ~~c. Registration hold on student's record; mandatory advising prior to next semester's registration~~
 - ~~d. Still allowed to use ePAWS for registration transactions~~~~~~
- ~~2. Academic Probation (University): Student falls below the above GPA thresholds which continue to be based on the number of credits earned at UNR
 - ~~i. 0-29 credits — cumulative UNR GPA is below 1.6~~
 - ~~ii. 30-59 credits — cumulative UNR GPA is below 1.8~~
 - ~~iii. 60 or more credits — cumulative UNR GPA is below 1.9~~
 - ~~iv. Action:
 - ~~a. Removed from major; cans stay in college or switch to undecided~~
 - ~~b. Receives letter from college and email from Admissions and Records~~
 - ~~c. Registration hold on student's record; mandatory advising~~
 - ~~d. Student limited to 12 credits/semester with approval of advisor, access to ePAWS denied; must register in person with advisor signed advisement sheet. With the implementation of the new registration system, it is hoped that electronic registration could be "authorized" thus eliminating the need for registration to be done in person but still allowing advisors to maintain control with respect to the student's enrollment. Until such point in time, it is suggested that a standardized form be developed and used by~~~~~~

~~all advisors to authorize enrollment in approved courses.~~

- ~~1) Student will be subject to dismissal if still on academic probation after attempting 24 additional UNR credits.~~
- ~~2) A school or college may still place a student on program probation whenever satisfactory progress toward degree objectives is not maintained.~~

~~3. Dismissal: Occurs if the student, after attempting 24 additional UNR credits beyond being placed on probation, a student is still on academic probation.~~

~~i. Action:~~

- ~~a. Receives letter from college and email from Admissions and Records.~~
- ~~b. Student will be immediately withdrawn from any classes for which the student has registered; any tuition paid will be refunded.~~
- ~~c. Student cannot attend as a non-degree student and is not eligible to attend summer session or enroll in courses through extended studies/independent learning.~~
- ~~d. Student is required to remain out for at least ~~two~~ **one** academic years.~~
- ~~e. Students seeking readmission must receive approval from the dean of the college the student wishes to enter prior to readmission.~~
- ~~f. Students should be prepared to provide as part of the readmission process, documentation that demonstrates improved academic performance or a readiness for academic success.~~
- ~~g. Students who are reinstated will be on academic probation. The college into which the student is readmitted may develop a prescribed program of study to which the student must adhere.~~
- ~~h. If a student is dismissed a second time, subsequent readmission will be allowed only with the approval of the Special Admissions Committee.~~

~~MOTION: Parker/Foust. To approved the recommendations to (C) Probation, Disqualification, Suspension and Dismissal Policies with a change to C (3)(i)(d) from two years to one year.~~

~~ACTION: Passed 1 abstention~~

President's Response: Revised Recommendation Considered in lieu of this recommendation.

Academic Standards Committee Recommendations - Revised

As approved by the Faculty Senate in August 2009

PROBATION/DISMISSAL:

5. The committee recommended a new policy, and after negotiating with A&R, the senate approved the following:
 - a) Anytime a student's UNR *cumulative* GPA falls below 2.0, the student is placed on PROBATION. Students on probation must receive academic advising in order to register.
 - b) Once a student bring his or her GPA back to 2.0 or above, the student is removed from probation. If a student remains on probation for three consecutive regular semesters, he or she is DISMISSED.
 - c) The college dean can make exceptions to the student's dismissal status.
 - d) Once dismissed, the student is not allowed UNR enrollment for a period of one calendar year. After one year, students may return to the university on second-semester PROBATION: the student must bring his or her cumulative UNR GPA up to 2.0 or above within two regular semesters, or they will again be DISMISSED. Again, the college dean can make exceptions to the student's dismissal status, and students may again be readmitted on probation after one calendar year.

President's Response: Approved.

Faculty Senate Academic Standards Committee 2009

Charge Two: Grade appeal policies and procedures.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. The current grade appeals policy is reasonable, but it has been clarified. A table has been developed to assist students, faculty and grade appeal committee members (see Appendix 1). The revised policy has slightly different time frame.

B. Clarify that the grade appeal policy should not be used when the grade appeal results from academic dishonesty.

C. New policy is as follows:

A course grade assigned by an instructor is **only** subject to the appeals procedure if:

- The instructor based this student's grade on factors other than the student's performance in the course and/or completion of course requirements, or
- The instructor based this student's grade on a ~~more-demanding~~ standard ~~than~~ different than what was applied to other students in the same section of the course.

The burden of proof that one of these two conditions holds rests on the student, but a grade appeal committee may request information from the instructor. If a student wishes to appeal a grade received as a sanction for an instance of academic dishonesty, the student must follow the Academic Dishonesty procedure.

There are four steps in the appeal process:

1. Consultation with instructor before filing Grade Appeal Form
2. Filing a Grade Appeal Form with Department Chair,
3. Review by a Departmental Grade Appeal Committee,
4. Review by a College Grade Appeal Board.

1. Consultation with Instructor

In the event that a student disagrees with the final grade received in a course, the student shall discuss the basis for the grade with the instructor. This allows clerical grade errors to be corrected by the instructor by means of the Change of Grade Form. After consultation, if the grade is still in dispute, the student may complete the Grade Appeal Form. The consultation step can be skipped only if the instructor is unavailable.

2. File Grade Appeal Form with Department Chair

If the student still feels the grade assignment meets one of the two bulleted criteria above, the student may complete a Grade Appeal Form and file it with the chair of the department offering the course. (In this document, the term "chair" may also refer to the director of a program offering the course, or a designee for the chair or program director.)

The Grade Appeal Form must be filed no later than 10 working days after the start of the next spring or fall semester, whichever comes first, after the grade is assigned. The chair has 5 working days after receipt of the Grade Appeal Form to contact the instructor and the student to see if an informal resolution can be reached. If informal resolution is not reached during these 5 days, then the chair has 5 more working days to request a written response from the instructor. The instructor has 10 working days to provide this response to the chair.

If the chair is able to facilitate an agreement between the student and the instructor on the final grade within 30 working days after the receipt of the Grade Appeal Form, this grade is considered final. If this grade is different from the original grade assigned by the instructor, the Registrar's Office will be notified.

3. Departmental Grade Appeal Committee

If the chair is unable to reach a resolution between the student and the instructor within 30 working days of receipt of the Grade Appeal Form, the chair will appoint a Departmental Grade Appeal Committee and forward the Grade Appeal Form, along with the instructor's response, to the Committee at the time of appointment. The Departmental Grade Appeal Committee will consist of the following four members: one student, one faculty member from within the department, and one faculty member from outside the department, and the department chair. The department chair will chair the Committee and act as a non-voting member. While the instructor and the student may comment on the composition of the committee within 2 working days of its appointment, the final decision on the committee's composition rests with the chair.

The Departmental Grade Appeal Committee does not have subpoena power. The principals (i.e., the student and the instructor) may not be represented by counsel. The hearing of the grade appeal by the committee is a closed meeting to be attended only by the Grade Appeal Committee, the student, and the instructor. The student or the instructor may waive his or her right to attend.

The Departmental Grade Appeal Committee may request additional materials from the student or instructor within 10 working days of the appointment of the committee, and those materials shall be provided to the Committee within 5 additional working days.

The Departmental Grade Appeal Committee will render a decision no later than 20 working days after it is appointed, and distribute that decision in writing to the student, instructor and department chair within the 20 working days. If neither the student nor the instructor contest the Departmental Grade Appeal Committee's recommendation within 5 working days of receipt of the recommendation, then the grade is final and not subject to further appeal and, in case the decision involves a change from the original grade, the Registrar's Office will be notified.

4. College Grade Appeal Board

Should the recommendation by the Departmental Grade Appeal Committee be contested by either the student or the instructor, the Grade Appeal Form and all related materials will be forwarded to the dean of the college or school which offers the course within 5 working days. Within 10 working days of receipt of these materials, the dean will appoint a College Grade Appeal Board, provide the Board with the materials related to the appeal, and will notify the student and instructor of its composition.

The College Grade Appeal Board will be comprised of three voting members: two faculty members from within the department that teaches the class and one faculty member from another department. Neither the instructor nor the

Departmental Grade Appeal Committee member from outside the department may serve on the College Grade Appeal Board. The student and the instructor may comment on the composition of the Board within 2 working days of its appointment. The final decision on the Board's composition rests with the dean.

The College Grade Appeal Board does not have subpoena power. The principals may not be represented by counsel. The grade appeal hearing by the Board is a closed meeting to be attended only by the Board, the student, and the instructor. The student or the instructor may waive his or her right to attend.

The College Grade Appeal Board may request additional materials from the student or instructor within 10 working days of the appointment of the Board, and those materials shall be provided to the Board within 5 additional working days. The Board will render a decision no later than 20 working days after it is appointed. This decision is **not** subject to appeal. The dean, department chair, instructor and student will be notified of the decision in writing within the 20 working days, and, in case the decision involves a change from the original grade, the Registrar's Office will be notified.

MOTION: Kumjian/Vogel. To approve recommendations regarding charge 2 as submitted, including the language in the document entitled, "Grade Appeal Modifications to Final Report".

ACTION: Passed Unanimously

President's Response: Dissatisfied. Is it possible to create a more expedited process? This process is too long and is not student friendly in terms of time.

Faculty Senate Academic Standards Committee 2009

Charge 3: Academic Dishonesty.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. Previous Recommendations, already approved by the Faculty Senate in May 2006, that we are carrying forward and recommending for immediate implementation.

1. Faculty and student web sites on ADH issues, resources, and online tutorial defining plagiarism. Additional resources and assistance should be provided to the Office of Student Conduct (OSC) to improve its online content and format, to provide more information (including links to other websites) that is in a form more accessible to students. By way of example, the UNLV website provides a useful model regarding a user-friendly outline of that institution's academic

dishonesty administrative procedures. The Online Writing Center at Purdue University provides an example of an excellent online tutorial defining plagiarism.

2. Students should be made aware of University policies on ADH & available resources at New Student Orientation. An existing Ethics Workshop should be mandatory for students as part of New Student Orientation.
3. Modules on plagiarism, academic dishonesty and proper citation should be developed for core classes. We recommend that such modules be developed by Office of Student Conduct but taught by regular core class instructors.
4. Faculty should be made aware of the policy requirement to report all cases of ADH to the Office of Student Conduct. This issue should be emphasized during New Faculty Orientation, and an annual email reminder sent to Chairs and Deans to remind their instructors (including LOA's) of this requirement. This requirement should also be emphasized in the mandatory course that Graduate Teaching Assistants are required to take.
5. Development of a streamlined, web-based reporting system for instructors to report ADH to Office of Student Conduct. We recommend that the OSC provides an easy-to-use form or template letter for faculty to alert report ADH, including cases where faculty members wish to deal with the matter informally. An example of such a form can be found on the UNLV website, <http://studentlife.unlv.edu/judicial/misconductPolicy.html>.
6. A student's home department, major and college should be informed of incidents of ADH. This can be tied to use of the web-based form, described above.
7. Development of sanctioning guidelines for faculty to refer to when deciding how to address ADH in their courses. Such recommendations for faculty should be provided as part of a revised OSC website. The OSC should be tasked with coming up with such recommendations in consultation with the Academic Standards committee. It should be emphasized that these are only guidelines, and that such academic sanctions will remain a matter of faculty discretion.
8. The University Code of Conduct and Policies (section IV, Academic Standards) should in separate sections lay out explicitly the nature of possible academic and administrative sanctions, and distinguish these two types of sanctions clearly. This is implemented in our recommended textual changes to the Code of Conduct (see attached).
9. The time frame for reporting ADH should be extended to 15 working days. This is implemented in our recommended textual changes to the Code of

Conduct (see attached). We have also changed the policy language from "...10 days from the alleged action" to "...15 working days from when the incident was identified or discovered."

10. An Honor Code should be drafted for the University. Such an honor code was drafted and agreed to on April 11, 2007 by the ASUN (document RC-0607-9). We recommend implementation of the honor code that has already been drafted.

B. Previous recommendations, approved by the Faculty Senate in May 2006, for which we recommend modification or reconsideration

1. UNR should purchase a license to Turnitin.com (anti-plagiarism software). The committee recommends evaluation of two alternatives: Turnitin.com and the SafeAssign program that is already included within WebCT. We further recommend that a future committee evaluate the question in greater detail by polling a group of potential users (e.g. instructors of core English classes) as to whether use of Turnitin.com would be a desirable, cost-effective solution.

2. Instructors should have the right to request additional sanctions beyond an F in the course, such as the right to refuse re-admission to the course section. The committee overwhelmingly voted against this recommendation, feeling it was too unforgiving and could create a situation where students might be locked out of taking courses that are necessary for their major requirements.

3. Adoption of the Q grade for cases of ADH, to appear on the transcript until a non-credit course on ADH is successfully completed. Although the Q grade is not feasible without BOR approval, it would be possible to implement a transcript notation of "academic dishonesty" within the current system. UNLV currently implements such a policy (<http://studentlife.unlv.edu/judicial/misconductPolicy.html> pp. 12-13). The committee recommends an identical policy at UNR, see the UNLV policy below with minor modifications.

A. In instances where it is determined that the academic misconduct is of both an intentional and egregious nature, the conduct sanction shall be recorded on the student's official and unofficial transcript with a transcript notation. The transcript of the student shall be marked "Disciplinary Notation due to Academic Dishonesty in (class) during (semester)." The transcript notation shall occur only upon completion of the student conduct proceedings. The conduct sanction notation shall not affect the grade point average, course repeatability or determination of academic standing. This conduct sanction notation is intended to denote a failure to accept and exhibit the fundamental value of academic honesty.

B. Once a conduct sanction notation is made, the student may file a written petition to the Academic Integrity [Appeal](#) Board to have the notation removed. The decision to remove the conduct sanction notation shall rest in the discretion and judgment of a majority of a quorum of the Board; provided that:

1. At the time the petition is received, at least 180 calendar days shall have elapsed since the conduct sanction notation was recorded; and,
2. At the time the petition is received, the student shall have successfully completed the designated noncredit Academic Integrity Seminar, as administered by the Office of Student Conduct; or, for the person no longer enrolled at the University, an equivalent activity as determined by the Office of Student Conduct; and,
3. The Office of Student Conduct certifies that to the best of its knowledge the student has not been found responsible for any other act of academic misconduct or similar disciplinary offense at the University of Nevada, [Las Vegas Reno](#) or another institution.

C. Prior to deciding a petition, the Academic Integrity [Appeal](#) Board will review the record of the case and consult with the Office of Student Conduct and responsible instructor or appropriate chair / director / supervisor. The decision of the [Appeal](#) Board shall not be subject to subsequent [Appeal Board](#) reconsideration for at least 180 calendar days, unless the [Appeal](#) Board specifies an earlier date on which the petition may be reconsidered. Subsequent [Appeal](#) Board determinations pertaining to the removal of the conduct sanction notation may be appealed to the [Vice President for Student LifeProvost](#). If the [Vice President Provost](#) removes the conduct sanction notation from the student's transcript, the [Vice PresidentProvost](#) shall provide a written rationale to the Appeal Board.

D. No student with a student conduct notation on the student's transcript shall be permitted to represent the University in any extracurricular activity, or run for or hold an executive office in any student organization which is allowed to use University facilities, or which receives University funds. Note that appropriate implementation of the transcript notation measure would require a course in place, presumably offered by the Office of Student Conduct (OSC), allowing students the opportunity to have the transcript notation removed.

4. Appendix 2 contains a revised Academic Dishonesty Policy.

MOTION: Kumjian/Vogel. To approve the recommendations for charge 3 as submitted

ACTION: Passed 1 opposed 2 abstentions

President's Response: Disapproved. Requires new resources. It does not appear as if the committee or the senate considered resources in making these recommendations. It would be irresponsible of the administration to support recommendations that place additional burdens on units whose budgets and resources have been cut. In addition, there is no indication that the OSC was consulted regarding these recommendations.