

Committee on Academic Policy (CAP): Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 27, 2024
Meeting #17 AY2023-2024

Attendees: B. Calli (RBE, CAP chair), B. Antupit (student representative), J. Dudle (CEAE, EDC Representative), A. Gericke (Dean of Undergraduate Studies, ad interim), D. Heilman (CBC, UOAC Representative), F. Levey (MME), F. Schroeder (student representative), B. Servatius (MA, CITP representative), S. Miles (Registrar)

Guest: Megan Tupaj (MA/AREN, Class of 2024)

1. Meeting was called to order at 2:07 pm.
2. Guest M. Tupaj provided comments on the grade appeal policy. M. Tupaj appealed her grade from ID2050 based on arbitrariness. She met with A. Gericke who was helpful with regard to writing the appeal. The compiled information was lengthy (26 pages) and required significant effort to prepare. She was provided support from faculty/administration while preparing the appeal, but the underlining tone was that “it’s not going to happen”. After she submitted the appeal, there was little support; an attitude that nothing was going to change; and a very lengthy delay during which M. Tupaj was only updated that a Board would be formed. Then, less than a week after being updated that there was still no Board, she suddenly received an email that the Board had met and rejected her appeal. The process overall was emotionally and mentally draining, and she would not recommend the process to any student who does not have a good support team. M. Tupaj noted that the final decision seemed to ignore evidence; she felt biased against as a female (the Board consisted of 3 males); and she thought that the system was rigged for students to fail. A. Gericke noted that FRC is a standing committee so it is unclear why the committee needed to be formed after the appeal request. CAP noted that after the student submits an appeal, the faculty member reads the appeal and responds, but the student has no rebuttal.

M. Tupaj was asked what she would change with the system. She noted that the catalog and webpage information on grade appeals is repetitive and inconsistent, and should be clarified. She also noted that the appeal process requires the student to meet with the faculty member, but the faculty member does not have to provide any reasoning – they can simply say “no” – so the student lacks perspective to launch an appeal. Also, the faculty member controls the process by setting meeting times, etc. She noted that the overall structure of the process feels biased against students. To improve the system, M. Tupaj noted that (a) a “rebuttal” is important so the student can respond to the faculty statements, (b) there should be a concrete timeline that is enforced for all parties, and (c) the required conversation with the professor should have a mediator.

As time was running out, CAP and M. Tupaj noted several other aspects of the process that may need further discussion: (a) should the FRC handle cases more like the Hearing Board, where parties verbally discuss their case?, (b) should there need to be an FRC member who is in the Global School for any appeal that involves ID2050 and IQP?, (c) it would be advantageous to have gender and program diversity on FRC, and (d) is there an opportunity to have more agreeable resolutions at the stage when the student meets with the department head?

3. Meeting adjourned at 2:58 pm

Submitted by C-Term Secretary J. Dudle