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USU ACADEMIC STANDARDS SUBCOMMITTEE
of the EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMITTEE

Minutes for March 7, 2006

Present: Jeffrey Walters (Chair), Stan Allen, Todd Crowl, Krystin Deschamps (sub) David Goetze, Dwight Israelsen, Vince Lafferty (sub), John Mortensen, Edward Reeve, Kathryn Turner, Spencer Watts

Excused: Scot Allgood, Heidi Beck, Weldon Sleight, Gary Straquadine

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Jeff Walters at 3:00 p.m. in Ag Sci 241.

1. Approval of the Minutes of the February 7, 2006 ASC meeting: Stan Allen moved and Dwight Israelsen seconded that the minutes be approved as written. The motion was adopted.

2. Follow-up on Committee actions: At the March EPC meeting the following ASC recommendations were approved by the EPC. (1) USU credits of 20 credits minimum for the Associate Degrees; (2) the language for the policy on jury duty; and (3) no change in foreign language test credits and cumulative GPA.

3. Uniform policy for appealing grades: Spencer Watts presented the revised Honor Code with procedures, rules and regulations which combined the faculty and student code procedures into one policy in the first four pages of the handout. Within the Student Code/Honor Code the Associate Dean had been removed a step in the appeal process; a new honor board installed, and an appeals board.

Todd Crowl questioned if both policies’ language was the same. He felt that the PRPC should review both the university and student codes to make them consistent. Kathryn Turner inquired how students were informed about this policy. Spencer Watts indicated that signs would be hung in classrooms and a statement could be included in the class syllabus. Spencer indicated that the feedback from students was favorable, and felt it was fair to both sides.

Kathryn Turner wondered if a written statement signed by the student should be required.

Through the committee members’ discussion it was felt that items 2 and 3 should include a reference where students could go to appeal. Also that items 7 and 10 were similar. It was felt that more work needed to be done on the policy. Spencer Watts moved that action on this issue be postponed to the next meeting, Vince Lafferty seconded, and the motion carried.

4. Policy on complete withdrawal after completion of 75% of term: Krystin Deschamps reviewed how students withdraw completely from one semester and then return the following semester. She felt that such students needed to contact their advisor and then meet with Krystin as the last contact so that she could
advise the student on considerations that might not be familiar to advisors. John Mortensen indicated that the advisors had to meet with the student first and then the student would go to the Registrar’s office for the last signature.

Todd Crowl moved that this issue be tabled for a future meeting, Krystin Deschamps seconded, and the motion carried.

5. Election of ASC chair for 2006-7 academic year: Dwight Israelsen moved that Scot Allgood be elected the ASC chair for 2006-7 academic year. Vince Lafferty seconded, and the motion carried.

6. Other business:

Academic Standing issue in Banner: Krystin Deschamps described how previously, when a student repeated a course at USU, his/her academic standing was automatically recalculated to reflect the new reality. If a student had been on probation in the fall, and then retook a course in the spring to pull up that grade, then (if the fall GPA was above a 2.0 as a result) the notation of probation was removed from the fall semester.

In Banner, the academic standing for a prior term is not recalculated, regardless of the number of repeated courses a student has that might change the standing. The Banner system regards academic standing as “locked in time.” Academic standing is determined at the time grades are posted for the term.

The most significant benefit of retaining the end-of-term academic standing is that it is an accurate reflection of what happened to a student in a given term. However, the biggest problem with retaining academic standing regardless of a changed grade from a previous term is that students are without recourse on the path to suspension, because repeating a course won’t alter standing.

The Registrar’s Office is currently exploring a programmatic way to recalculate academic standing for previous terms without having to do it manually.

The committee felt that Banner needs to be fixed concerning the problem described. Samples need to be brought to a future meeting, so Vince Lafferty moved that this topic be rescheduled for the April meeting, Ed Reeves seconded and the motion carried.

NOTE: Due to ongoing business that needs to be addressed, the April 11, 2006 ASC meeting will be held as scheduled.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.