**Educational Policy Committee**

**October 17, 2018**

**Minutes**

**Committee Members Attending:** Watkins (chair), Lotto, Zhang, Hoelscher, Bodzin, Liu, Piispanen, Pascarosa, Elroukh, Wesson (ex officio).

**Committee Members Absent:** Webb, Gunter, Li

**Guests:** Bell, Jensen, McClaind, Szczepanski, Tonkay, Wilson, Zalatan.

As the chair would be late, the committee by consensus came to order.

The committee made minor changes to the draft minutes that had been circulated. As revised, the minutes were approved unanimously.

The chair arrived just after the introduction of the first agenda item, but before discussion

**First agenda item: Grievance policy as described in the Catalog and R&P**

Katrina Zalatan presented the issues on which the SOS Committee wishes to have guidance. Grade grievances are not listed as the purview of SOS. It is unclear how these sorts of grievances should move forward. The Catalog discusses informal and formal routes for grievances (general academic grievances, not grade grievances specifically) through the instructor, dean of the college, and the Dean of Students Office.

There was a consensus that the university needs a written policy for grade grievances. This process should not lead to SOS, but to the dean’s office, with a final appeal in writing to the provost (or designee).

Students provided feedback, stating that it is important to be very clear in the language what the process is. For example, not all students understand who the undergraduate director is, etc.

The chair asked for and received consent to work with Jennifer Jensen to develop language for the Catalog, and if necessary for R&P on undergraduate grade grievances, and explore the possibility of standardizing (the currently differing) academic grievance policy statements across colleges. Committee members will have an opportunity for feedback.

**Second agenda item: R&P 3.1.5 Full-time undergraduate students**

The committee considered a proposal, prepared last year by the former committee chair, Anne Anderson, to change R&P 3.1.5. This section begins, “Every student who maintains a semester roster of at least twelve academic credit hours shall be considered a full-time student.”

Discussion focused on whether to delete a second sentence that states, “In exceptional cases a student, who with consent of his or her dean carries a minimum of nine credit hours during the semester, may maintain the university privileges of a full-time student” and replace it with a the proposed sentence, “***In their last semester, a student has full-time privileges when taking the credits required for graduation.****”*

After discussion, the committee determined that the second sentence currently in R&P was not necessary, but that neither is a replacement sentence necessary because the main implications of granting full-time status have to do with policies beyond the purview of R&P (e.g. housing and sporting facilities access, financial aid eligibility) and that in long-term practice deans have not generally been involved in providing the consent as suggested by the current language.

By consensus the committee agreed to forward to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee a proposal to delete the second sentence of R&P 3.1.5.

**Third agenda items: R&P 3.4 Auditors**

The committee considered a proposal placed on the docket last year by the previous committee chair to alter the R&P language on auditors (See below, proposed new language in bold text, proposed deletion in strikethrough text.)

A student who has incurred no scholastic conditions or failures during the previous semester may be admitted as a listener in not more than one course, which course shall be outside the curriculum requirements. ~~Application for such admission is by petition approved by the departmental chairperson~~~~and the chairperson of the department concerned.~~ ***Undergraduate students may request permission to audit a course by submitting a petition to the Standing of Students committee. Graduate students may audit a course when approved by the course instructor, department chair, and advisor.*** In no case shall a student who has attended a course as an auditor be given an anticipatory examination for credit or register for the same course in the future.

The RAS confirmed that the proposed new language is the current general practice of the RAS, which requires students to send audit requests through SOS and that such petitions are relatively rare. Discussion ensued about the value of establishing a clear deadline for such audit requests, with agreement that the deadline should be similar to that for electing the pass-fail option.

The committee by consensus agreed that the chair would draft new language and return the new proposal to the committee.

The committee adjourned at 4:25 p.m.