

GBC Faculty Senate
Academic Standards Committee
Written Report, 16 September 2013

The Academic Standards Committee have discussed and approved in conference in the following items:

- **Action Item Request: Procedure Changing P/W course grading to S/U**

Under the new funding formula, grades of W will not be funded. This creates an obvious problem with courses which are currently grade P/W, such as INT 100 Orientation or the various community courses such as Driver's Education. Switching these courses to a P/F would allow funding, but create a negative GPA impact for Fails but no corresponding positive GPA for Passes.

The Academic Standards Committee heartily recommends replacing the P/W grade system for all classes currently using it with a S/U grade system. The S/U system currently exists under Board of Regents policy, would be fully funded under current formulas, is currently supported by the Peoplesoft system, and raises no known issues with financial aid policies. A grade of S (Satisfactory) would count for degree requirements, and is considered equivalent to a C-minus or higher; a U (Unsatisfactory) would be equivalent to grades D-F and not count for degree requirements.

If approved, this policy would be put in place for courses beginning Spring Semester 2014.

- **Action Item Request: Low-Yield Program Review policy [see attached]**

The 2011 revision to the Board of Regents policies created a new procedure for Low-Yield Program Reviews, which required GBC to bring their policies in line with BOR policies. The BOR defined low-yield programs as producing fewer than 20 graduates over a three-year period.

The Academic Standards Committee recommends adoption of the Low-Yield Program Policy.

- **Action Item Request: Elimination of Academic Programs policy [see attached]**

Similarly, the BOR has also revised their policies concerning the procedures for the elimination of academic programs, and GBC needs to bring its policy into compliance.

The Academic Standards Committee recommends adoption of the Elimination of Academic Programs policy.

- **Non-Action Item: Report on Grade Appeal/Professional Misconduct Case [see attached]**

Last May during the 2012-2013 Academic Year, the Academic Standards heard a grade appeal request from two students who simultaneously brought charges of professional misconduct against the instructor of record. The case was decided by the Academic Standards committee and official notification sent to the students, the instructor, and the office of the Vice-President of Student Services on 6 May 2013.

Due to concerns of FERPA and Human Resources regulations, however, the report provided to Faculty Senate cannot contain identifying information on either the students or the instructor in question since it is available in a public forum. A new report is provided in which the identifying information has been removed.



POLICY AND PROCEDURE

Title:	Low-Yield Program Reviews
Policy No.:	3.42
Department:	Academic Affairs
Contact:	Vice-President for Academic Affairs

Policy

At least every three years Great Basin College shall review the productivity of its academic programs that are at least 10 years old. To achieve this cycle, productivity reviews shall be done as part of the scheduled five-year program review cycle (GBC Policy 3.40) and then again two years after that. For each productivity review the data shall be used from the three years before the year of the review. Programs that meet the definition of low-yield programs through productivity reviews shall then be further evaluated for consideration for elimination or for continuation under an exemption or a written set of conditions.

Associate, baccalaureate, and stand-alone Certificate of Achievement (30 or more credits) programs shall be designated as low-yield if there are less than 20 graduates from any program in the last three consecutive years before the review. Certificate of Achievement programs whose curriculum is embedded into the content of an Associate of Applied Science degree shall have the numbers of graduates from these programs combined. (As an example, if within the evaluated three-year time frame a Laser Technology program has 14 AAS graduates and 12 Certificate graduates, this is not a low-yield program.) Emphases within a degree shall be combined as a total for the one degree. "Patterns of Study" are not approved degrees, and graduates with these patterns shall count toward the appropriate totals of Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degrees awarded.

This policy shall be in accordance with NSHE Code as prescribed in Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 6.

Procedures

1.0 Program Productivity Review Schedule

1.1. Upon adoption of this policy, all GBC programs older than 10 years shall undergo an initial screening for those meeting the low-yield definition and designation. Programs meeting the criteria for low-yield designation shall then be evaluated under the criteria for continuation or elimination and given appropriate recommendations. After the initial review, programs more than 10 years old shall have subsequent productivity reviews in conjunction with scheduled five-year program reviews. Two years after each five-year program review each program shall have a new productivity review.

1.2. The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) shall maintain a schedule of program productivity reviews. A file of the reports of these reviews shall also be maintained. Programs may also be reviewed for productivity at any time by request of the President of the College or the VPAA.

2.0 Review Process

2.1. Program Data. As the first step in the program productivity review, the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness shall collect the pertinent data for subject programs. A form shall be developed that indicates the name of the program being reviewed, the different levels or emphases of the program that are being combined for review, the number of graduates in each of the previous three consecutive years, and two check boxes to indicate (1) meet the criteria for continuation, or (2) meet the criteria for further review as a low-yield program. This step involves only collecting and presenting the data and the initial determination of how a program meets the productivity criteria.

2.2. Programs Meeting Productivity Criteria. Programs that meet or exceed the minimum graduation productivity requirements provided in this policy shall require no further review until the next review cycle. The program reports shall be retained in the records of the Office of the VPAA.

2.3. Low-Yield Program Review. Programs designated as low-yield by the program data review must be further evaluated. If the productivity review is in conjunction with a five-year program review, the program review committee shall also provide an evaluation and recommendation on the program relating to its low-yield status. If the productivity review occurs outside of the five-year review cycle, the VPAA shall appoint a five-member review committee consisting of two faculty members of the department hosting the program, two faculty members from outside the department, and one member from the Curriculum and Articulation Committee not being a member of the department. A written report on the low-yield program shall include a recommendation to (1) eliminate the program, (2) allow its continuation under exemption criteria, or (3) allow the program to continue subject to a defined set of conditions. The report with its recommendation shall be submitted to the faculty Curriculum and Articulation Committee for review and action and then be taken to the Faculty Senate for approval. The recommended action shall then be provided to the President's Council for action. A decision is made by the President of the College.

3.0 Exemption Criteria

3.1. Possible Exemptions from Elimination. A low-yield program may be exempted from elimination if it is determined that it meets any of the following criteria:

- a. Is central to the educational mission of GBC;
- b. Meets a demonstrated workforce or service need of the state or GBC service area, including any projected future needs of the state or region;
- c. Demonstrates an increase in student demand through a pattern of increasing enrollment;
- d. Supports underrepresented student or community groups;
- e. Is funded by non-state resources to an extent that offsets the lack of graduates; or
- f. Is provided a set of conditions, including a time limit of not more than three years, which the program must meet to fulfill the production criteria for continuation (continuation conditions described below).

3.2. Conditions for Continuation. A review committee may recommend a series of actions, steps and/or benchmarks for a low-yield program to achieve within a set time limit of not more than three years. The conditions must be clearly described with a timeline for each condition to be met.

3.3 Continuing Review Schedule. Regardless of exemptions and conditions for continuation, all programs will continue to be reviewed for productivity on the established schedule.

4.0 Final Decision

4.1 The final action taken on low-yield programs shall be the decision of the President of the College. Each year the President shall report to the Chancellor of NSHE all programs designated as low-yield and the

results of the institutional review process of such programs as required by NSHE Code in Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 6.5.

4.2 If any program is eliminated under this policy, the procedure for elimination shall be followed as stated in GBC Policy 3.42, Program Elimination.

Revised by Faculty Academic Standards Committee & Office of Academic Affairs: **March 2002**

Reformatted & updated by President's Council: **September 10, 2008**

Contact the assistant to the President for any questions, changes, or additions.



POLICY AND PROCEDURE

Title:	Elimination of Academic Programs
Policy No.:	3.41
Department:	Academic Affairs
Contact:	Vice-President for Academic Affairs

Policy

Under certain conditions it may be necessary for GBC to eliminate academic programs. This may be for reasons of low enrollment, low graduation, finance, lack of instruction, or other reasons. Policies and procedures outside of this policy may exist providing the processes for identifying programs for elimination for differing reasons. At such time as a decision is made to pursue the elimination of a program through the procedures of the College, the following steps must be followed:

- a. A recommendation for program elimination must be received by the President of the College through the President's Council; the President makes the decision to eliminate a program. Recommendations may be received from program reviews, a Budget Task Force, the curricular review process, Faculty Senate, a department, a member of President's Council, or other recommending bodies. All recommendations for program elimination must be accompanied by a written statement or report with substantiation for the elimination.
- b. Once a GBC decision is made to eliminate a program, the procedures of program elimination within the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) must be adhered to, and the elimination must be approved by NSHE.
- c. Existing students within the program must be notified and provided with their options.

Personnel matters associated with program elimination are separate from the elimination of the program. Personnel separation from the College because of program elimination is handled through separate policies and procedures.

Procedures

1.0 Plan and Student Notification

1.1. Once a program is fully approved for elimination, a written plan shall be made for students in the program to complete its requirements within two years after the year the program is designated for elimination. Students actively enrolled in the program must be informed of this plan and informed that they have only two years for this to be in effect. The plan may include a schedule of classes that will be taught one last time or suitable class substitutions may be identified. It is the responsibility of the students to follow this plan, as there will be no assurances of classes being offered after the end of the second year. Students may also be advised into other, similar programs so that there is little or no loss of work already completed.

Revised by Faculty Academic Standards Committee & Office of Academic Affairs: **March 2002**

Reformatted & updated by President's Council: **September 10, 2008**

Contact the assistant to the President for any questions, changes, or additions.

Great Basin College
Faculty Senate
Academic Standards Committee

Public Committee Report – Meeting of 3 May 2013
2:00 pm; Lundberg 114 (Elko) and GBC 109 (Winnemucca)

The Academic Standards Committee met on Friday, 3 May 2013 to hear a written request for grade appeal case from two students received 26 April 2013. The grade appeal hearing was the third step in the process outline in the *GBC General Catalog 2012-2013*, pages 53-54.

The two students also brought complaints of professional misconduct against the instructor related to charges of plagiarism which were the origin of the grade dispute, pursuant to the procedure outlined on page 53-54 of the *GBC General Catalog 2012-2013*.

The two cases were heard jointly per the request of the two students.

Due to FERPA regulations, the students cannot be identified in this public report.

Due to GBC personnel regulations, the identity of the instructor has also been withheld from the public report.

The meeting was held with all members of the Academic Standards Committee in attendance (including a member attending via IAV connection), with Gary Hanington serving as chair. The committee interviewed the instructor. Also interviewed was Dr. Danny Gonzalez, Chair of the Social Sciences Department, who had presided over Step Two of the Grade Appeals Process.

Although the two students in question had agreed in advance to the schedule, only one student attended the meeting via phone conferencing and was interviewed by the committee.

Following the interviews and a review of the written materials in question, the Academic Standards Committee made the following recommendations:

- 1) The Committee rejected the request for grade appeal by the students. The grades for the student issued by the instructor stand.
- 2) The Committee found no basis for a charge of professional misconduct against the instructor.

A written notice of these decisions has been sent individually to the two students.