

UNR Faculty Senate 2008-09 Academic Standards Committee Final Report

Members

Maureen Cronin, Associate Registrar
Mary Groves, Managerial Sciences
Christopher Herald, Mathematics and Statistics
Stephen Lafer, Curriculum, Teaching and Learning
Frank Lucash, Philosophy
Nancy Markee, Advising Center
Patrick Ragains, Libraries
Banmali Rawat, Electrical and Biomedical Engineering
David Sanders, Civil and Environmental Engineering (Committee Chair)
Gini Vogel, Art
Peter Weisberg, Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences

March 12, 2009

Academic Standards Committee Final Report 2008-2009

The following report is a summary of the activities for the 2008-2009 Academic Standards Committee. The report is divided into four major parts. Section I describes the charges that were given to the committee. Section II provides the general process that was used to form the recommendations. Sections III to VII provide the committee's recommendations to each of the charges. Section VIII provides a recommendation for next year. The report also includes three appendices.

I. SUMMARY OF CHARGES

The 2008-2009 Academic Standards Committee was given the following charges.

- 1) Meet with academic advisors to consider in more detail the potential problems with the first three proposals of the 2007-2008 committee, which were tabled by the Senate. Revise these proposals as necessary, and bring them back to the Senate in the Fall for further consideration.
- 2) Review and propose revisions to the university's policy on student grade appeals, with particular attention to the policies and procedures used in peer and aspirant institutions.
- 3) Building on the recommendations of prior committees, recommend a specific set of standards for a consistent faculty response to student academic dishonesty.
- 4) Consider alternative methods of using university resources more efficiently and enabling students to reduce the time to completion of their degrees, including increasing the use of four- and five-credit courses, encouraging more courses in the summer semester, and whether the 120 or 124-credit undergraduate minimum for graduation is optimal. Make recommendations.

A fifth issue was brought to the committee concerning residency requirements for majors and minors.

This report describes the recommendations by the committee in response to all five charges.

II. COMMITTEE PROCESS

In order to address the committee charges, committee members were divided into the following task groups. A task group leader was assigned for each charge.

	Advising	Grade Appeals	Academic Dishonesty	Time of Degrees
David Sanders	X	X	X	X
Christopher Herald		X*	X	
Banmali Rawat	X		X	
Maureen Cronin		X		X*
Frank Lucash		X		X
Patrick Ragains	X		X	
Peter Weisberg			X*	X
Nancy Markee	X*			X
Mary Groves		X	X	
Stephen Lafer	X	X		
Gini Vogel	X			X

* Task Group Chair

In addition to meeting as individual task groups, the main committee met the following dates: September 16, September 30, October 21, November 18, December 9, January 23, February 5, February 6, February 20 and March 5. The following pages will provide the recommendations developed by the task groups, and then discussed and approved by the full Academic Standards Committee.

III. CHARGE ONE

Meet with academic advisors to consider in more detail the potential problems with the first three proposals of the 2007-2008 committee, which were tabled by the Senate. Revise these proposals as necessary, and bring them back to the Senate for further consideration.

Charge One was divided into three areas: A) Drop/Withdrawal Policy, B) Grade Replacement Policy and C) Probation, Disqualification, Suspension and Dismissal Policies.

A. **DROP/WITHDRAWAL POLICY**

Via the advisors listserv, those involved with academic advising were asked to provide input to the following queries:

1. Should students be required to get a signature from an advisor in order to withdraw from a course after the first 10 days of the semester?
2. Should there be a limit in terms of the number of times a student can withdraw from the same class?
3. Should there be a limit in terms of the total number of allowable withdrawals?

Academic advisors overwhelmingly rejected the idea of requiring the signature of either the instructor or the advisor prior to withdrawing from a course. While seemingly a well-intentioned idea, they felt this was not practical and would potentially result in more students receiving failing grades. Reasons cited included:

- students not having sufficient information on which to base a decision until the last minute and then not being able to find the individual whose signature was required
- possible reluctance to approach a faculty member
- students need to take responsibility for their actions

The majority of those responding did not feel there should be a limit in terms of either the number of times a student can withdraw from the same class or the total number of allowable withdrawals. Reasons cited included:

- possibility of numerous appeals
- might unfairly punish students for circumstances out of their control
- lack of any criteria for determining a number
- the financial penalty of repeatedly withdrawing from classes (no refund after the first 10 days of the semester)
- might drive students away from UNR once a set limit has been met
- might result in more students receiving failing grades

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 a point 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.

B. GRADE REPLACEMENT POLICY

With respect to possible changes in the grade replacement policy, input from advisors was solicited with respect to the following:

1. Should there be a limit on the number of times a student can file grade replacements for the same class?
2. What should the time frame be in terms of when a student must retake a class to utilize the grade replacement policy?
3. What should be the maximum number for classes for which students can replace grades?
4. Should the policy be expanded to include 300-400 level courses?
5. Should students be restricted from replacing grades for which they have earned a grade of a 'C' or higher?
6. Should students be allowed to replace a grade in a class once they have taken and passed a course for which the original course was a prerequisite?

Responses from members of the advising community showed no consensus with respect to whether or not there should be a limit on the number of times a student can file a grade replacement for the same class. There was also mixed response concerning expanding the policy to include 300-400 level courses.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The following recommendations for changes in the current policy are supported both by the majority of responses received from advisors and the committee:

1. 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 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.

The purpose of the grade replacement policy is to give students the opportunity to improve their academic performance in one or more courses in which they have done poorly. The committee discussed in length the idea of restricting grade replacement to include only courses in which a student has received a grade of C- or lower. We concluded, however, that students may differ in their definitions/perceptions of poor academic performance and that all students should be given the same chance to improve their GPA's through the use of the grade replacement policy.

C. PROBATION, DISQUALIFICATION, SUSPENSION AND DISMISSAL POLICIES

In an effort to provide the committee with input from advisors, the following questions were sent out on the advisors listserv for response:

1. Should there be mandatory advising for all students who fall below a 2.0 UNR GPA?
2. What should happen to students when they are disqualified?
3. Should DQ students be allowed to take 12 credits with approval of their advisor?
4. Should there be a time limit in terms of how long a student can remain on DQ status?

Additionally, the policies of numerous peer institutions were reviewed (see attached).

At present there exist three categories of unsatisfactory academic standing: 1) Academic Warning (below a 2.0 but above the probationary cutoff based on number of credits earned), 2) Academic Probation (below the Warning threshold as defined by credits), and Disqualification (occurs when a student on probation for one semester fails to raise their GPA above the Warning threshold). Students on Warning or Probation receive a letter notifying them of their academic status and are recommended to contact their advisor and other academic support services. Students on Disqualification are removed from their academic program, have a registration hold placed on their records, must meet with an advisor and obtain a signed registration sheet and register for classes in person. They are currently limited to six credits or two courses per instructional term.

The committee suggests a significant revision in our current policies for students who are in unsatisfactory academic standing (below a 2.0 UNR GPA). The committee examined the probation and dismissal policies of the following Universities: Arizona State University, Utah State University, Colorado State University, Oregon State University, Washington State University, University of Oregon, University of California, Davis, and University of Arizona.

RATIONALE FOR CHANGES:

1. Research shows that advising interventions with selected student populations to be one of the highest contributors to improved retention.
2. All but two respondents to survey distributed to advisors (out of approximately 30) supported mandatory advising for all students falling below a 2.0 UNR GPA.
3. Our current policy is extremely lenient as compared to our peer institutions; the majority dismiss after 2 consecutive semesters/quarters below a 2.0. These changes are, however, more in line with those of other institutions; could not find an example of a peer institution that does not dismiss/suspend students when academic performance is not considered satisfactory.
4. Requiring dean's approval for readmission would hopefully eliminate students from going elsewhere and taking non-degree relevant courses to demonstrate improved academic performance (criteria for readmission not dependent on taking courses elsewhere as options in northern Nevada are limited; other factors such as life-changing experiences can be considered; colleges can establish readmission standards and make them known to students).
5. For many students, allowing them to continue to attempt courses at UNR without intervention simply results in the "digging of an even deeper hole" from which the student must climb out of to eventually graduate.

Based on both sources of data, the committee endorses the recommendations that follow.

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 e-mail 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; can stay in college or switch to undecided
 - b) Receives letter from college and e-mail 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 e-mail 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 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

IV. CHARGE TWO: GRADE APPEAL POLICY AND PROCEDURE

Review and propose revisions to the university’s policy on student grade appeals, with particular attention to the policies and procedures used in peer and aspirant institutions.

The committee examined the following institutions in order to develop their recommendations: University of Nevada, Reno, University of Arizona, University of California-Davis, University of Colorado-Boulder, Colorado State University, Iowa State University, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, University of Utah, and Washington State University.

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 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.

V. CHARGE THREE: ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

“Building on the recommendations of prior committees, recommend a specific set of standards for a consistent faculty response to student academic dishonesty.”

Prior committees have conducted extensive research on the issue, resulting in clear recommendations to the Faculty Senate. The 2005-2006 Academic Standards committee focused on the Academic Dishonesty (ADH) issue and produced a highly detailed report. Each subsequent year's Academic Standards committee has included a subcommittee that followed up on ADH. Therefore, the task group decided to focus on why previous recommendations have not been implemented. The group met with Sally Morgan (Office of Student Conduct) and

Bill Cathey (Vice-Provost), and contacted numerous other individuals regarding feasibility of committee recommendations and progress that has been made to date. These activities have resulted in modifications to certain previous recommendations, and identification of a large subset of recommendations that should be considered for immediate implementation.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. Previous recommendations that have already been implemented

1. *Faculty workshops to help discourage dishonesty should be available on a voluntary basis.* This is now available from the Office of Student Conduct.
2. *Standard language regarding the UNR Academic Dishonesty policy should be made available for inclusion on course syllabi.* The Courses and Curriculum website provides several examples of Academic Dishonesty statements for syllabi.
3. *Change grade replacement policy such that poor grades due to Academic Dishonesty cannot be replaced through Grade Replacement procedures.* Implemented.

B. 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.

C. 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 non-credit 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 Life~~ Provost. If the ~~Vice President~~ Provost removes the conduct sanction notation from the student's transcript, the ~~Vice President~~ Provost 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.*

VI. CHARGE FOUR: REDUCE THE TIME TO COMPLETION OF DEGREES

Consider alternative methods of using university resources more efficiently and enabling students to reduce the time to completion of their degrees, including increasing the use of four- and five-credit courses, encouraging more courses in the summer semester, and whether the 120 or 124-credit undergraduate minimum for graduation is optimal. Make recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Do not recommend increasing the number of credits of a course as a way to increase completion rates.
 - i. There are 99 four-credit undergraduate courses offered; 11 five-credit courses, and 16 variable credit courses in which students can earn more than 3 credits.
 - ii. Courses with greater than 3 credits are often difficult to fit into a full schedule. In addition, creating new courses is a time consuming process.
2. Encouraging more courses in the summer semester
 - i. Having more summer semester and wintermester courses would be advantages to students. Certain types of courses can be successful in an accelerated format. A long-term goal would be for summer to be supported by the state and seen as a third semester.
3. Reduce the Board of Regents (BOR) minimum credit hours requirement from 124 to 120 credits. The committee respects the right of individual programs to determine appropriate credit requirements for their degrees.
 - i. The BOR Handbook establishes a minimum of 124 semester credits. Most UNR degrees require at least 128 credits (See Appendix 3). Table 1 is a summary of the information in Appendix 3.

Table 1: UNR Total Degree Credits

Total Credits	Number of Degrees
124	2
126	2
128	81
129	4
130	1
131	3
133	2
138	1

While 124 credits is the minimum at UNR, few programs are at the minimum. In multiple casual conversations, people indicated that they thought the minimum was 128.

- ii. We compared UNR graduation requirements to those of our peers. Most of our peers have a minimum total credits requirement of 120 semester credits for undergraduate degrees. (see Table 2)
- iii. The University Courses and Curricula Committee discussed a draft of the proposal on February 2nd. The following concerns were expressed:
 - a. The timing of the change, in the midst of a grave budget crisis, might give the public the impression that the University was relaxing its academic standards to save money.

- b. Though the Academic Standards Committee Chair assured the group that changes to total credits requirements would be made only at the request of departments/programs, UCCC members were leery of pressure from above to reduce total credit requirements.

Table 2: Total Credit Comparison

Institution	Minimum Number of Credits
University of Nevada, Reno	124
University of Arizona	120
Arizona State	120
University of California, Davis	180 quarter credits = 120 semester
University of Colorado, Boulder	120 credits
Colorado State University	120
Iowa State University	122
University of Nebraska-Lincoln College of Arts & Science	125
University of Oregon	180 quarter credits = 120 semester
Oregon State University	180 quarter credits = 120 semester
University of Utah	122
Utah State University	120
Washington State University	120

VII. CHARGE FIVE: RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR MAJORS AND MINORS

Students must have a minimum number of credits at UNR to earn a degree, but the requirement does not specify that the credits must be applied towards the degree. Therefore a student could potentially earn a degree having never taken a course in the major or minor. Therefore, the committee was asked if the university should have residency requirement for our major and minors.

RECOMMENDATION:

The basic residency requirement for UNR is that 32 upper division credits must be earned at UNR. The committee recommends that at least 1/3rd of those credits must apply to the degree. It is recommended that the same 1/3rd requirement be applied to minors as well. Therefore 1/3rd of all minor requirements must be earned at UNR.

VIII. FUTURE ACTIONS ITEMS FOR THE ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE

- A. The 2008-2009 committee recommends that next year's committee investigate the need to have a "statute of limitations" on courses. For example, can upper division courses from 20-years ago be applied to a degree today?
- B. It is important that a follow-up and assessment mechanism be put in place for recommendations. The first objective would be to verify implementation of the recommendations that are approved. The second objective would be to determine if a recommendation accomplished its purpose. A good example of this would be the recommendations for academic warning/probation/dismissal. It would be good to evaluate the effectiveness in several years.

Appendix 1: Timeline for Grade Appeal Process

Step 1: Student		
Student consults with instructor. If no resolution, student proceeds to Step 2.		
Step 2: Department Chair		
Total elapsed work days	Work days allotted for each step	Step descriptions Steps may stop at any time if resolution is reached.
0		The Grade Appeal Form is filed with Department Chair no later than 10 working days after the start of the next spring or fall semester, whichever comes first, after the grade is assigned.
5	5	Chair receives grade appeal from student and has 5 working days to negotiate a resolution between student and instructor.
10	5	Chair has additional 5 working days to request a written response from instructor.
20	10	Instructor has 10 working days to provide a written response to chair's request.
30	10	Chair has an additional 10 working days to work out a solution or appoint a Departmental Grade Appeal Committee.
Step 3: Department Grade Appeal Committee		
50	20	Department Grade Appeal Committee must render a decision on the appeal within 20 working days of appointment; within this time frame, the committee has 10 working days to gather more information if necessary and 5 working days are allotted to provide the material requested.
55	5	If student or instructor disagrees with the Department Grade Appeal Committee's recommendation, either has 5 working days to appeal to the College Grade Appeal Board.
Step 4: College Grade Appeal Board		
65	10	The dean has 10 working days to appoint a College Grade Appeal board.
85	20	College Grade Appeal Board must meet within 20 working days of appointment to make a final decision; within this time frame, the board has 10 working days to gather more information if necessary and 5 working days are allotted to provide the material requested. Decision reached is final.

Once the grade appeal has been filed, it may take as much as 17 weeks to make a decision if it proceeds all the way to the College Grade Appeal Committee.

Appendix 2: Revised Policy Language Relating to Academic Dishonesty.

Undergraduate Academic Dishonesty Procedures

A faculty member who suspects a student of academic dishonesty must notify the student of the charge and proposed sanction, in writing, no later than ~~fifteen~~ (15) working days from when the alleged incident was identified or discovered or ~~fifteen~~ (15) working days after the last day of instruction, whichever comes first. Notification must be hand delivered or sent by certified mail. A copy of the notification to the student must be sent to the director of Office of Student Conduct (OSC) and to the director of the department or program offering the course. The student has ten (10) working days to appeal after receipt of the notification.

1. If the student admits guilt, or fails to appeal, the faculty member may impose an academic sanction commensurate with the offense. In addition, the director of OSC may impose an appropriate disciplinary sanction. If the student accepts the sanctions, the matter is ended.
2. If the student denies the charge or does not approve the sanction, the student must state this, in writing, to the chair of the department within the ten (10) working days noted above. Within the next five working days, the chair must inform the faculty member, ~~then~~ and then refer the matter to the director of OSC for a hearing by the Academic Integrity Board. The student should be allowed at least ten (10) working days to prepare for a hearing; but this period may be waived by the student.

A. If the Academic Integrity Board determines guilt, it may recommend disciplinary sanctions to the director of OSC for implementation. In any case, the faculty member is so apprised and may then impose an academic sanction consistent with the offense. The student has no further appeal rights except of a sanction affecting a final grade as noted above.

B. If the Academic Integrity Board finds the student not guilty, the matter is closed.

Academic Integrity Board

A. The Academic Integrity Board shall consist of the following members with due consideration being given to possible conflict of interest:

1. Two undergraduate students appointed by the ASUN Judicial Council,
2. Two faculty members selected by the executive board of the Faculty Senate, and
3. A third faculty member selected by the Provost, who will serve as chair of the board.

To ensure the impartiality of the hearing board, members must be appointed from departments other than those in which the case originated and in which the accused student is majoring.

B. Impanelment Deadline

The board shall be impaneled by the director of Office of Student Conduct (OSC) and set a hearing date within 15 working days after the matter has been referred to the director.

C. The hearing procedure is as follows:

1. The accused student will be called to appear before the Academic Integrity Board by the director of OSC. If the student wishes to be accompanied by an advisor or an attorney, the board must be notified at least 48 hours in advance. The faculty member shall also be present, and may be accompanied by an advisor, or by an attorney, whenever the student chooses such counsel.

2. In the hearing, the chair will state the content of the report of alleged academic dishonesty and the specific charges made.
3. The faculty member will appear before the board to present evidence against the student. The chair of the board may call other witnesses. The accused student and board members may cross examine.
4. The student will appear before the board to present evidence on his or her own behalf.
5. The board members will then meet in closed session to make a final decision.
6. If the student is found to be guilty, the hearing board shall consult with the director of -OSC about any past record of academic misconduct.
7. The hearing board then shall recommend appropriate disciplinary sanctions to the director of -OSC and apprise the faculty member of its deliberations.

Graduate Academic Dishonesty Procedures

A. A faculty member who suspects a student of academic dishonesty must inform the student, in writing, of the accusation and proposed sanction no later than fifteen (15)~~10~~ working days after the alleged action or fifteen (15)~~10~~ working days after the end of instruction, whichever comes first. Notification must be hand delivered or sent by certified mail.

Within 10 working days of receipt of such action the student may file a request with the department chair for a review and possible mediation of the matter within 15 working days. If the student rejects the review by the chair and/or the outcome of mediation, the chair shall refer the matter to the director of Office of Student Conduct (OSC) for further appeal.

The director of OSC will be available to assist all parties in implementing the following appeal process.

A student may appeal the reviewed decision of the faculty member to the dean of the Graduate School. This appeal must be made in writing within 10 working days after the student has been informed in writing of the faculty member's decision.

B. The dean may take any of the following actions:

1. Resolve the conflict through mediation
2. Dismiss the charge
3. Uphold the faculty member's decision in its entirety
4. Impose a lesser sanction
5. Impose a greater sanction.

The dean's action must be taken within 10 working days of receipt of the appeal.

C. The dean must inform the student in writing of any action taken within the above 10 working days. A student may appeal the dean's decision to the Provost. This appeal must be made in writing within 10 working days after the student received the decision in writing from the dean. This appeal shall be referred by the Provost to the Academic Integrity Board, which shall be impaneled by the director of student judicial affairs.

D. The Academic Integrity Board shall consist of the following members with due consideration being given to possible conflict of interest:

1. Two graduate students appointed by the Graduate Student Association,
2. Two faculty members selected by the executive board of the Faculty Senate,
3. A third faculty member selected by the Provost, who will serve as the chair of the board.

To ensure impartiality of the hearing board, members must be appointed from departments other than those in which the case originated and in which the accused student is majoring.

The board shall be impaneled and set a hearing date within 15 working days after the appeal is referred to the Provost.

E. The hearing procedures for graduate students are the same as for undergraduate students, as stated above. The Academic Integrity Board must forward its findings and recommendations to the Provost within 5 working days of the hearing's conclusion. The Provost will review the case and inform the student and all other concerned parties of the final action taken within 10 working days of the hearing's conclusion.

Appendix 3: Credit for a Degree by College

DPTITLE1	DPTITLE2	DPROG	REQHRS	ELECTIVES	MINOR REQ
CABNR	AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS	BS-AAE	128	34-37	
CABNR	ANIMAL BIOTECHNOLOGY	BS-ABT	128	21-25	
CABNR	ANIMAL SCIENCE	BS-ASC	128	22-29	
CABNR	ANIMAL SCIENCE (RANGE LAND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION OPTION)	BS-ASR	128	7-14	
CABNR	BIOCHEMISTRY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY	BS-BMB	128	16-19	
CABNR	ECOHYDROLOGY	BS-EHY	128	6-10	
CABNR	ENVIRONMENTAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMICS	BS-ERE	128	24-30	
CABNR	ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE	BS-EVS	128	12-20	
CABNR	FOREST AND RANGELAND MANAGEMENT	BS-FRM	128	17-23	
CABNR	NUTRITION (DIETETICS)	BS-NTD	128	19-22	
CABNR	NUTRITION (NUTRITIONAL SCIENCES)	BS-NTS	128	16-19	
CABNR	VETERINARY SCIENCE	BS-VS	128	NA	
CABNR	WILDLIFE ECOLOGY AND CONSERVATION	BS-WEC	128	10-19	
COBA	ACCOUNTING	BS-ACC	124	4-7	
COBA	ACCOUNTING/INFORMATION SYSTEMS	BS-AIS	128	8-11	
COBA	ECONOMICS	BA-EC	128	33-50	
COBA	ECONOMICS	BS-EC	128	14-17	
COBA	FINANCE	BS-FIN	128	0-2	
COBA	GENERAL BUSINESS	BS-GB	128	8-11	
COBA	INFORMATION SYSTEMS	BS-IS	128	8-11	
COBA	INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS	BS-IB	133	23	
COBA	MANAGEMENT	BS-MGT	128	11-14	
COBA	MARKETING	BS-MKT	128	8-11	
COBA	SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT	BS-SCM	128	5-8	
COE	EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION	BS-ECE	128	25-28	
COE	ELEMENTARY EDUCATION	BS-EED	128	4-10	
COE	ELEMENTARY EDUCATION/SPECIAL EDUCATION	BS-EXE	128	0-3	
COE	HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY STUDIES	BS-HDF	128	42-45	
COE	SPECIAL EDUCATION	BS-XE	128	10-13	
COEN	CHEMICAL ENGINEERING	BS-CHE	133	0	
COEN	CIVIL ENGINEERING	BS-CE	131	0-3	
COEN	COMPUTER AND INFORMATION ENGINEERING	BS-CIE	128	0-3	
COEN	COMPUTER SCIENCE	BS-CS	128	12-15	
COEN	ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING	BS-EE	129	0-3	
COEN	ENGINEERING PHYSICS	BS-EP	129	3-6	
COEN	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING	BS-EVG	131	0-3	
COEN	MATERIALS SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING	BS-MAT	126	0	
COEN	MECHANICAL ENGINEERING	BS-ME	129	0-3	
CLA	ANTHROPOLOGY	BA-AN	128	13-36	Y
CLA	APPLIED MUSIC	BM-AM	128	0-12	
CLA	ART	BA-AR	128	7-29	Y
CLA	ART	BF-ART	128	0-8	
CLA	ART (ART HISTORY)	BA-AHI	128	7-29	Y
CLA	ENGLISH (LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS)	BA-ELL	128	10-32	Y
CLA	ENGLISH (LITERATURE)	BA-ELT	128	10-32	Y
CLA	ENGLISH (SECONDARY TEACHING)	BA-EST	128	10-32	Y
CLA	ENGLISH (WRITING)	BA-EWR	128	10-32	Y
CLA	FRENCH	BA-FR	128	16-38	Y
CLA	GENERAL STUDIES	BG-GS	124	NA	
CLA	GERMAN	BA-GR	128	16-38	Y
CLA	HISTORY	BA-HI	128	10-32	Y
CLA	INTERIOR DESIGN	BS-ID	128	6-9	
CLA	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	BA-IA	128	56-59	Y

CLA	MUSIC	BA-MU	128	8-30	Y
CLA	MUSIC EDUCATION	BM-ME	138	0	
CLA	PHILOSOPHY	BA-PH	128	10-32	Y
CLA	POLITICAL SCIENCE	BA-PSC	128	16-38	Y
CLA	PSYCHOLOGY	BA-PSY	128	16-24	Y
CLA	SOCIOLOGY	BA-SOC	128	16-38	Y
CLA	SPANISH	BA-SP	128	16-38	Y
CLA	SPEECH COMMUNICATION	BA-SPC	128	13-35	Y
CLA	THEATRE	BA-TH	128	13-35	Y
CLA	THEATRE	BF-TH	128	15-20	
CLA	WOMEN'S STUDIES	BA-WS	128	13-35	Y
CLA: SRJS	STUDIES / CRIMINAL JUSTICE	BA-CJ	128	13-32	
CLA: SRJS	STUDIES / CRIMINAL JUSTICE (PRE-LAW)	BA-CJL	128	19-38	
COS	ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCES	BS-ATS	128	23-26	
COS	BIOLOGY	BS-BI	128	34-42	
COS	CHEMISTRY	BS-CH	128	35-46	
COS	CHEMISTRY (ENVIRONMENTAL)	BS-CEC	128	15-27	
COS	GEOGRAPHY	BA-GGR	128	7-29	
COS	GEOGRAPHY	BS-GGR	128	16-22	
COS	GEOLOGICAL ENGINEERING	BS-GE	128	0-2	
COS	GEOLOGY	BS-GL	131	0-10	
COS	GEOPHYSICS	BS-GPH	130	0-3	
COS	HYDROGEOLOGY	BS-HYG	129	1-4	
COS	MATHEMATICS	BA-MA	128	9-32	Y
COS	MATHEMATICS	BA-MAA	128	9-32	Y
COS	MATHEMATICS	BA-MAD	128	9-32	Y
COS	MATHEMATICS	BA-MAS	128	9-32	Y
COS	MATHEMATICS	BS-MA	128	17-23	
COS	MATHEMATICS	BS-MAA	128	17-23	
COS	MATHEMATICS	BS-MAD	128	17-23	
COS	MATHEMATICS	BS-MAS	128	17-23	
COS	MINING ENGINEERING	BS-MIN	126	0-3	
COS	PHYSICS	BS-PHY	128	22-25	
COS	PROFESSIONAL CHEMISTRY	BS-CHP	128	14-25	
DHS	HEALTH ECOLOGY	BS-HE	128	30-38	
DHS	NURSING	BS-NU	128	0-3	
DHS	NURSING	BS-NU2	128	0-3	
DHS	SOCIAL WORK	BA-BSW	128	27-32	
DHS	SPEECH PATHOLOGY	BS-SPH	128	24-57	
ID	NEUROSCIENCE	BS-NSC	128	24-31	
RSJ	JOURNALISM	BA-JO	128	1-9	
UNIVERSITY	BACHELOR OF ARTS: ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES	BA-ENV	128	0-36	
UNIVERSITY	BACHELOR OF SCIENCE: ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES	BS-ENV	128	0-16	