

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The first meeting of the University Senate for the 1982-83 academic year was called to order by Chairman Stan Tackett at 3:20 p.m. in Pratt Auditorium on Tuesday, September 14, 1982.

Senators F. Anderson, J. Mueller and K. Chickos were excused from the meeting. In addition, the following Senators were absent: Abrams, Alexander, Asting, Bahn, Bright, Christodouleas, H. Cunningham, Dakak, Ford, Gordon, Hershman, Ice, Lenglet, McCavitt, McNabb, Miller, Millward, Murray, Neal, Patterson, Riesenman, Solak, Staszkiwicz, Syty, Taiani, Vexler, Vold, Whitmer, Wilkie, Wolfe, Zoni, Andreassi, Caldwell, G. Chiapetta, J. Chiapetta, Dorunda, Ferris, Jons, Krause, Long, McClelland, Maskrey, Matthews, Mazzoni, Neely, Phillippi, Plevinsky, Rombach, Schmucker, Schroeder, Sieber, Serafin, Smith, Tate, Taylor, Wagner, White and Wiethorn.

IUP President Worthen welcomed the Senators back for the fall semester. He indicated that although final enrollment figures are not yet available, we expect about 50 more students than last year, or about 12,450. The average SAT score for incoming freshmen increased by two points this year to 1,013. Dr. Worthen indicated that there is some activity in the House Subcommittee on Higher Education on the SSME Bill and that he anticipates its passage in one form or another this fall. IUP's position continues to be one of gaining more local control.

Dr. Worthen indicated his willingness to participate in and cooperate with the Senate-appointed Committee on University Policy which was appointed to deal with the issue of improving communications. The committee met last spring and one of their suggestions was the scheduling of open forums to provide an opportunity for discussion of various issues on the campus.

Dr. Worthen announced that approximately \$160,000 in funds for special projects has been allocated and will be spent this year for a variety of purposes, including academic and cultural enrichment, academic scholarships, athletic scholarships, research, outdoor recreation activities, writing development programs, museum, theater, and others.

Dr. Stan Tackett, Senate Chairman, welcomed the Senators and urged them to work toward the charge of the University Senate, which is the preservation and maintenance of academic integrity at this institution. He indicated that extra copies of the current Constitution and Bylaws of the Senate are available. Chairman Tackett also announced that the Board of Trustees approved the actions taken by the Senate at its May 4, 1982 meeting.

On a motion by Senator Chamberlin, seconded by Senator Ali and passed by the Senate, Anita Henry and Robert Patsiga were approved as Senate representatives on the Committee on Distinguished Achiever Scholarships.

On a motion by Senator McCue and a second by Senator Duntley, the minutes of the May 4, 1982 meeting were approved, with the following notation: Page 4, Item 3: FA 100 was approved as a General Education Fine Arts course.

The Rules Committee (A), chaired by Senator Chamberlin, listed the following for Senate information:

a. Scheduled Senate Meetings - 1982-83 Academic Year

| | |
|--------------------|------------------|
| September 14, 1982 | February 8, 1983 |
| October 12, 1982 | March 8, 1983 |
| November 9, 1982 | April 12, 1983 |
| December 7, 1982 | May 10, 1983 |

- b. Agenda items are due two weeks prior to the meeting dates listed above. Send items to the Senate Secretary, Anthony Nastase, in Weyandt 18 (Ext. 2269).

Jeff Peterson was unanimously elected to the position of Vice Chairman of the Senate.

Hugh Johnson was elected over Ron Ali to serve as the Fine Arts representative on Committee E, Faculty Research, Library and Educational Services.

Senator Renee Liscinsky, Chairman of Committee E, announced that her committee will meet on Tuesday, September 21, 1982 at 3:15 p.m. in Uhler 101.

Committee B1, Academic Affairs, chaired by Senator Ruth Anderson, announced that they will meet on Tuesday, September 21, at 3:15 p.m. in Ackerman 207 and will meet each Tuesday following the Senate meetings.

Senator Park, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Budget Committee, listed the following information:

- a. Approximate total income of the University for 1982-83: \$62.2 million
- b. \$6 million increase over 1981-82
- c. \$46.9 million goes for personnel costs
- d. \$9.2 million for fixed expenses
- e. \$6.2 million for operating and equipment budget
- f. Tuition income, including room and board: \$29.5 million

Senator Norton reminded the Chairman that a permanent Senate committee must be named to review creative teaching proposals. This will be taken care of.

Items of New Business for future meetings should be submitted in writing to the Senate Chairman prior to the call to order of that meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A.J. Nastase

Anthony Nastase
Secretary, University Senate

1 4-82

0

PROPOSED GRADE APPEALS POLICY

IUP Student Government Association

September 1982

Section I: INTRODUCTION

The grade appeals procedure presently used is a great concern to the student body. The goal of the SGA Academic Affairs committee was to evaluate the situation and initiate any changes which would enable more efficient and positive results to all persons involved. We present what we consider to be a fair procedure, which would be satisfactory to students, faculty, and administrators. This policy was approved by the Student Government Association on April 5, 1982.

Section II: BASIS OF APPEAL

Appeal of a grade will be permitted on one or more of the following grounds:

1. Discrimination based upon
 - a. personal appearance
 - b. sex
 - c. sexual preference
 - d. handicap
 - e. race or national origin
 - f. religious or personal beliefs
2. Instructor's violation of University policy as stated in the IUP Student Handbook.
3. Grades violating previously set objective grading scales.
4. Unsubstantiated claims (i.e. accusing a student of cheating without proof.)

-more-

Section III: INFORMAL PROCEDURES

The student claiming a grievance should first discuss the discrepancy with his/her instructor to develop and initiate a resolve which is acceptable to both. If the student is not satisfied with the results, he/she should meet with the chairperson of the department to which he/she is appealing. If still unsatisfied, he/she should discuss the matter with the dean of the school. An advocate from SGA will accompany the student through this procedure, if requested.

Section IV: FORMAL PROCEDURE

If the student is not satisfied with the results of the informal grievance procedure, he/she may obtain a grade appeals form and request that the Academic Provost or Associate Provost assemble a grade review committee. The form must be filed with the provost's office within thirty (30) days into the semester following the semester in which the grade is received. Grade appeals would not be processed during summer, therefore, any grade received in spring or summer sessions would be appealed in the fall. A hearing will be scheduled in summer only if the student's academic eligibility is jeopardized by the grade in question. This would also apply to a graduating senior.

The provost's office would then notify the dean, department chairperson, and the SGA Academic Affairs committee of the intent of appeal.

Step 1: Preliminary Hearing

A preliminary review board of students will be formed through SGA to determine the legality and basis of the student grievance. The three (3) voting members of the committee shall be appointed by the SGA president. The chairperson of the SGA Academic Affairs committee will preside over the investigation. If the board determines a basis for the grievance, the provost's office will be informed of the decision and the Grade Review Committee will be organized and a hearing time determined. If the preliminary hearing yields no legitimate basis for appeal, the student shall be informed and the process discontinued. The appeals form shall be returned to the office of the Provost.

Step 2: Formation of the Review Committee

The Grade Review Committee shall be established under the supervision of the provost's office. The committee shall consist of seven (7) members. Of these seven, five (5) shall be voting members: an academic dean or associate dean, two faculty members, and two students. The Affirmative Action officer and the SGA Academic Affairs chairperson shall serve as non-voting advisers.

A. The dean will be selected from a pool of five people appointed by the provost. The grieving student and the instructor each may request the removal of two or less deans from the pool if those people are considered biased for any reason.

B. The two (2) faculty members shall be randomly selected from a pool of 10 instructors appointed by the chairperson of the University Senate.

C. The two (2) student members of the committee shall be selected from a pool of 10 SGA members appointed by the president of SGA in conjunction with the Academic Affairs Committee.

In both cases, the student and instructor may request the elimination of any person who they believe may not be able to make a fair judgement of the case in question.

Step 3: The Hearing

Both the student and instructor may present their cases to the committee. Each may also bring one observer. However, the observer may not participate. Any question that is pertinent to the case may be asked of the student or the instructor.

The committee will then privately deliberate the facts brought forth in the case and vote accordingly. If less than four (4) members feel that the grade is unfair, the case will be dismissed. However, if four (4) or more members feel the grade is unfair, the committee has the power to change any objective grade, for example, true-false, multiple choice, and short answer tests. A majority vote will be necessary to decide a new grade. In the case of a subjective grade, the grade will be considered by a mutually acceptable person agreed upon by the faculty member and the committee. This person will evaluate the work in question through a comparison to the papers, essays, etc. of other students from the class.

In this manner, the independent person making the evaluation may establish if the work has been graded in concurrence with the professors grading standards or published criteria for such papers.

If the committee is not satisfied with the results, the Affirmative Action officer may be called upon to investigate the situation and discrimination charges may be filed. The provost will be notified by proper form.

Section V: CLOSING REMARKS

All steps of the above procedure will be kept completely confidential. Also, no actions or facts brought forth by the proceedings (with the exception of the grade and the form of decision sent to the office of the provost) will become part of any permanent records. Taped transcripts of the hearing will be filed in the APSCUF office and in the SGA office in locked cabinets until such time that the student involved terminates enrollment at the university or graduates. All evidence of the hearing will be destroyed at that time. It is understood that no appealed grade can be reduced.

9-15-82.
jay