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The Academic Standards and Calendar Committee met on 24 April 2013.

We discussed several proposals to make changes to the university manual, and agreed to propose the following changes to Faculty Senate:

1. An amendment to University Manual Section 8.20.50:

   **Current Section 8.20.50**
   Major Fields of Study. An undergraduate student's concentrated field of study in a degree-granting college shall be the student's "major"; University College students may have a "preferred major." The major field of study for graduate students shall be the student's "program." Curricular requirements for majors and programs are defined in the University Catalog. At least half of the credits required in an undergraduate student's major field of study must be earned at The University of Rhode Island. A student's major(s) or program(s) and option(s) will be listed on the student's permanent academic record after graduation.

   **Proposed Revision**
   Major Fields of Study. An undergraduate student's concentrated field of study in a degree-granting college shall be the student's "major"; University College students may have a "preferred major." The major field of study for graduate students shall be the student's "program." Curricular requirements for majors and programs are defined in the University Catalog. At least half of the credits required in an undergraduate student's major field of study must be earned at The University of Rhode Island, with exception for an approved articulation agreement in Nursing. A student's major(s) or program(s) and option(s) will be listed on the student's permanent academic record after graduation.

   **Rationale**
   Nursing has an articulation agreement approved by the provost and parties at both CCRI and URI which will allow more than half of the credits for Nursing students to be taken at CCRI, pending this change. A smoother transition for students between CCRI and URI will help the College of Nursing to meet the heavy demand put on all of nursing education to avert a health care crisis due to a pending national shortage of nurses.

2. An amendment to University Manual Section 8.26.13
Faculty members bear responsibility for the evaluation of students and their professional judgment in this regard is to be respected. Undergraduate and graduate students who object to a recorded grade in a course should discuss the matter initially with the instructor. If the issue remains unresolved, students should make their case in writing to the instructor's department chairperson or immediate administrative supervisor. The chair/supervisor should respond to the request, in writing, after a decision is made. If the chairperson/supervisor thinks the appeal has merit, she/he should so inform the instructor, providing to the instructor a copy of the student's written appeal as well as of the chair's/supervisor's written response. If this still fails to produce resolution, the chairperson/supervisor should refer the matter to a departmental or college appeals committee for a recommendation. (The latter would be appropriate in colleges lacking departments or where department faculty have voted to delegate the authority to a college appeals committee. For petitions concerning grades, appeals committees at both levels shall include a faculty member from a closely allied department or discipline.) If, after investigating the appeal, the committee concludes that compelling reasons exist to modify a grade, it will give the instructor a written explanation of its decision and ask that person to make the change. If the instructor still declines, he/she must provide the committee with a written explanation of the reasons for refusing. If, after considering the instructor's explanation, the committee agrees unanimously that it would be unjust to let the original grade stand, it shall direct the chairperson/supervisor that the grade be changed over the instructor's objection. The chairperson/supervisor will then initiate the change, notifying the instructor, the student, the instructor's dean, the student's dean, and the Office of Student Affairs of this action. The only exception to these guidelines shall be in cases where the instructor can no longer be consulted (e.g., that person has died or moved to an unknown address). In these circumstances, the appropriate chairperson/supervisor shall act in the stead of the absent instructor and modify a student's grade if a departmental or college appeals committee unanimously recommends such action in writing. In general, grades under appeal should not be considered when evaluating students for continuance in an academic program or for scholarship eligibility. The filing of the appeal must occur within two semesters following the issuing of the grade.

Rationale
(1) Addition of phrase: Common sense seems to dictate that an instructor has a right to see a student’s written appeal of a grade, as well as the chair’s/supervisor’s response. There has, however, been a recent case in which a department chair initially refused to allow a faculty member access to a student’s written appeal; he allowed access only when the
faculty member visited him, together with a union representative. The addition to 8.26.13 would forestall such incidents in the future.

(2) “Should” to “shall”: “Should” is weaker than “shall” inasmuch as it may be interpreted as a strong recommendation and indicating what will happen in most cases; it leaves, however, open the possibility of exceptions. “Shall” precludes this possibility.

(3) “Will” to “shall”: “Will” does not indicate a norm; normative statements are to be made in this context.

3. A proposal to add 8.70.50 to the University Manual

**Proposed 8.70.50:**
The J-term session runs from 2 January through the Friday before spring semester begins, with timetables and meeting schedules to be determined on a course-by-course basis. Travel-based courses may require travel before or after these dates. Grades for J-term courses will be due before spring semester begins.

**Rationale**
This schedule would match that of similar sessions at several area schools (UNH, Providence College, and UMass Dartmouth), and provides for flexibility for individual courses. This schedule provides grading time and a final grade deadline before spring semester starts, and is consistent with the term being a January-only term, as previously approved by Faculty Senate.

4. An amendment to University Manual Section 8.53.10

**Current 8.53.10**
Grades. Student grades are defined as follows:
A -- Superior
B -- Good
C -- Fair
D -- Low grade, passing
F -- Failure
I -- Incomplete
S -- Satisfactory, course taught on S-U basis
S* -- Satisfactory, course taken by a graduate student under the Pass-Fail grading option
U -- Unsatisfactory, course taught on S-U basis
U* -- Unsatisfactory, course taken by a graduate student under the Pass-Fail grading option
P -- Passing, course taken under the Pass-Fail option
NW -- Enrolled - No work submitted
NR -- Enrolled - No grade reported #06-07—22

**Proposed Revision to 8.53.10**
Grades. Student grades are defined as follows:
A -- Superior
B -- Good
C -- Fair
D -- Low grade, passing
F -- Failure
I -- Incomplete
S -- Satisfactory, course taught on S-U basis
S* -- Satisfactory, course taken by a graduate student under the Pass-Fail grading option
U -- Unsatisfactory, course taught on S-U basis
U* -- Unsatisfactory, course taken by a graduate student under the Pass-Fail grading option, not calculated into graduate GPA
P -- Passing, course taken under the Pass-Fail option
NW -- Enrolled - No work submitted
NR -- Enrolled - No grade reported #06-07--22

**Rationale**
The practice has been not to include grades of U into graduate GPAs, but the manual does not reflect this practice. The graduate manual and the university manual conflict on this issue. This change would bring the two manuals in sync with one another. (Graduate work may be deemed “unsatisfactory” at a much higher level than “failing”; including it in the GPA as “failing” is not representative.)

5. An amendment to University Manual Section 8.53.11

**Current 8.53.11**
Grades shall be given quality point values as follows:
A = 4.00 points A- = 3.70 points B+ = 3.30 points B = 3.00 points
Proposed Revision to 8.53.11
Grades shall be given quality point values as follows:
A = 4.00 points A- = 3.70 points B+ = 3.30 points B = 3.00 points B-
C+ = 2.70 points C = 2.00 points C- = 1.70 points D+ = 1.30 points D = 1.00 points F = 0 points U = 0 points U* = not
calculated in GPA

Rationale
The practice has been not to include grades of U into graduate
GPAs, but the manual does not reflect this practice. The graduate
manual and the university manual conflict on this issue. Graduate
work may be deemed “unsatisfactory” at a much higher level than
“failing”; including it in the GPA as “failing” (0 quality points) is not
representative.

6. An amendment to University Manual Section 8.53.30

Current 8.53.30
S/U Courses. Certain courses do not lend themselves to precise
grading (e.g., research, seminar). For these courses, only a
Satisfactory (S) or Unsatisfactory (U) shall be given to all students
enrolled. To qualify as an S/U course, the course must be approved
by the Faculty Senate after recommendation by the Curricular Affairs
Committee and/or the Graduate Council. S/U courses shall be so
labeled in the University Bulletin. An S/U course is not to be counted
as a course taken under the Pass/Fail grading option. Courses
numbered below 100 that are graded on an S/U basis shall not be
included in the calculation of a student's quality point average or
credits earned.

Proposed change to 8.53.30
S/U Courses. Certain courses do not lend themselves to precise
grading (e.g., research, seminar). For these courses, only a
Satisfactory (S) or Unsatisfactory (U) shall be given to all students
enrolled. To qualify as an S/U course, the course must be approved
by the Faculty Senate after recommendation by the Curricular Affairs
Committee and/or the Graduate Council. S/U courses shall be so
labeled in the University Bulletin. An S/U course is not to be counted as a course taken under the Pass/Fail grading option. Courses numbered below 100 or 500 and above that are graded on an S/U basis shall not be included in the calculation of a student's quality point average or credits earned.

**Rationale**
The practice has been not to include grades of U into graduate GPAs, but the manual does not reflect this practice. The graduate manual and the university manual conflict on this issue. Graduate work may be deemed “unsatisfactory” at a much higher level than “failing”; including it in the GPA as “failing” (0 quality points) is not representative.