

MINUTES

Meeting of the Hunter College Senate

12 October 2022

The 670th meeting of the Hunter College Senate convened at 4:03 PM in HW 714.

Presiding: Laura S. Keating, Chair

Attendance: The elected members of the Senate with the exception of those marked absent in Appendix I.

Alternate Senators were formally seated in accordance with the procedures approved by the Senate for in-person meetings, and they were enabled to vote using iClicker.

Agenda: Chair Keating informed the body that the President would not report today. The report from the Undergraduate Course of Study Committee and Graduate Course of Study and Academic Requirements Committee was postponed until 9 November. The report from the General Education Appeals Committee was postponed until 30 November. Also, the Nominating Committee's report was added to the agenda under the Administrative Committee report. Finally, three more items were added under the Administrative Committee report: an announcement about the 26 October meeting, Vice Chair announcement about an upcoming Student Caucus meeting and an update on the Board of Trustees' authorization of a remote participation option for those in extraordinary circumstances. The agenda was adopted as revised.

Minutes: Minutes of 4 May 2022, 11 May 2022, and 25 May 2022 were approved as distributed.

**Report by the
Administrative
Committee:**

a) Special Senate Election for Vacant At-large Seats

In accordance with Article IV, 2H i & ii of the Charter for a Governance of Hunter College, the Administrative Committee is presenting the names of all nominees received to date:

Faculty:	Steven Trasino (UPH)
	Mark Miller (English)
Student:	Ariadna Pavlidis-Sanchez (Public Health)
	Isabella Grullon (Political Science)
	Ronette Johnson (Psychology)

It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the nominees. The motion carried by unanimous consent.

b) Approved Curriculum Changes

The following curriculum changes as listed in the attached report dated 12 October 2022 have been approved as per Senate resolution and are submitted for the Senate's information. Items: US-2442 Jewish Studies Program (New courses, Cross-listing, and adding W and P&D/A) and US-2452 Geography and Environmental Science (Change in courses and adding SWo and WoC).

c) Election of Search Committee for Dean of School of Nursing

Election of two new nominees for one vacant faculty seat and up to six new nominees for three vacant student seats that will be forwarded to the President.

FACULTY

~~Prof. Lorie Goshin~~
Prof. Steve Baumann
Prof. Elsie Jolade

56
57 Prof. Elizabeth Cohn

58
59 NEW:

60 Prof. Stephen J. Yermal
61 Prof. Aliza Bitton Ben-Zacharia

62
63
64 It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the new nominees for
65 the Faculty Panel. The motion carried by unanimous consent.

66
67 **STUDENTS**

68
69 ~~Kris Angelo Natividad~~
70 ~~Niamh Crowley~~
71 ~~Amanda Diglio~~
72 ~~Donovan Cameron~~

73
74 NEW:

75
76 Jonathan Quillin
77 Nikko Nakamura
78 Stephanie Juarez
79 Michelle Li
80 Molly Sautner

81
82 It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the new nominees for
83 Student Panel. The motion carried by unanimous consent.

84
85
86 **d) Nominating Committee**

87 Chair Keating called on Professor Lisa Marie Anderson, former Chair of the Nominating
88 Committee, to present a report.

89
90 The Nominating Committee is submitting the following nominations for seats currently vacant
91 on Senate Committees:

92
93
94 **1. UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE**

95 Student: Nicole Palmetto (Public Health)

96
97 **2. GRADE APPEAL COMMITTEE**

98 Student: Nourhan Ibrahim (Political Science)
99 Nicole Palmetto (Public Health)

100
101 **3. NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

102 Faculty: Yuan Yin (Economics)

103
104 **4. MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE**

105 Student: Nourhan Ibrahim (Political Science)
106 Nicole Palmetto (Public Health)

107
108 **5. COMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION**

109 Faculty Alternate: Stephanie Margolin (Library)

110
111
112 It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the nominees.

116
117 The motion carried by unanimous consent.
118

119 **e) Announcement about the 26 October meeting**

120 Chair Keating informed the body that the Administrative Committee cancelled the 26 October
121 meeting. In its place, the General Education Committee Pluralism & Diversity sub-committee
122 will hold a Town Hall. Chair Keating invited Professor Lazaro Lima, co-Chair of the sub-
123 committee, to talk about the upcoming Town Hall.
124 Professor Lima said the following:

125
126 “Thank you, Laura. Good afternoon everyone. I am Lazaro Lima. As Professor Keating
127 mentioned, I serve as co-Chair of the Pluralism and Diversity committee. I want to briefly share
128 with you a couple of items about the organization of the committee meeting that we are having
129 next week, so my appreciation to the Senate for giving us the opportunity to have that
130 conversation and for making this possible. I really want to share the three things about the
131 proposed Town Hall that we will be having.

132
133 The first part really involves communication and briefing about the trajectory of how we got to
134 where we got in terms of Presidential Task Force on Racial Equity's recommendations that were
135 made to the Senate, and the work that we have been doing on the subcommittee itself.

136
137 Second, we expect to invite faculty chairs or interested faculty to discuss their experiences with
138 the P&D requirement. We will be reaching out shortly, in order for them to share their
139 perspectives, what their departments have been doing, and some of the challenges they see ahead.

140
141 Third, from that, we really want to stress the importance of input and we are going to have ample
142 time for questions from participants. I just learned from Laura that we are also going to be able
143 to ZOOM the meeting. That will certainly give us the ability to expand possibility for feedback
144 from folks.

145
146 So, those three items are really the only things that I needed to share with you. If you have any
147 questions, I am happy to take them right now.”

148
149 **f) Announcement by Vice Chair about an upcoming Student Caucus meeting**

150 Chair Keating called on Hunter Moran, Vice Chair of the Senate, to make an announcement.
151 Mr. Moran said the following:

152
153 “Thank you, Professor Keating. Hi, my name is Hunter. I am the Vice Chair. I want to announce
154 that the Student Caucus will be run next week on Wednesday. We want everyone to spread the
155 word and invite some friends and people who might be interested in joining the Senate and
156 getting more involved in our community. So, to the professors here, please spread the word. We
157 will be hosting it hybrid. Students at Hunter who want to be involved will also be able to sit in.
158 It will be on the 10th floor in the East building. So, please pass along the information. The date
159 is Wednesday, October 19th at 3pm, so a week that we do not have any Senate events. Students
160 will learn more about the Senate and how to get more involved. Thank you.”

161
162 **g) Update on the Board of Trustees' authorization of a remote participation option for those**
163 **in extraordinary circumstances**

164 Chair Keating said the following:

165
166 “As I reported at our last meeting, CUNY General Counsel was drafting a resolution for the BOT
167 authorizing the use of remote participation for members who are unable to attend in person due
168 to extraordinary circumstances. These members may vote but cannot count toward a quorum.
169 This resolution was approved on October 3 by the BOT Committee on Governance and is to be
170 considered at the BOT October 24 meeting. If it is passed on October 24, it would be effective
171 immediately. One part of the resolution is that the Board not only approves this for itself, but
172

173 **Minutes**
 174 **Meeting of the Hunter College Senate**
 175 **12 October 2022**
 176

177 also for all units of the college governed by the state Open Meetings Law. In particular, it says
 178 that each ‘unit, department or committee...may, in their discretion use videoconferencing
 179 according to this policy.’ The Administrative Committee will be drafting a brief resolution for
 180 adopting such use for the Senate and its committees to approve at our November 9th meeting.
 181 There are some committees meeting between October 24 and November 9th and the
 182 Administrative Committee asks permission of the Senate to allow those committees to use the
 183 remote option for members in extraordinary circumstances prior to that vote at our November 9th
 184 meeting.” There was no objection.
 185

186 **Committee**
 187 **Report:**

Undergraduate Academic Requirements Committee

188 Chair Keating called on Professor Kevin Sachs, Chair of the Undergraduate Academic Requirements
 189 Committee, to reintroduce the **Resolution on Double Counting of Courses Between or Among Majors**
 190 **at Hunter College.** Debate followed.
 191

192 **RESOLUTION ON DOUBLE COUNTING OF COURSES BETWEEN OR AMONG MAJORS**
 193 **AT HUNTER COLLEGE**
 194

195 **RESOLVED, that as of the Fall 2023 semester, the following policy shall be implemented:**
 196

197 “Policy on Double Counting Between or Among Multiple Majors
 198

199 Courses may satisfy the requirements of more than one major. Double counting between or among
 200 majors occurs when a student uses a course or courses to count towards the credit requirements of
 201 more than one declared major. When double counting is allowed, the student does not need to take
 202 additional courses to reach the required number of credits in the major.
 203

204 After approval through curricular governance procedures of the Hunter College Senate, departments
 205 or programs may allow double counting in their major programs. This means that a department or
 206 program may allow courses already allowed in the major to count towards the major’s credit
 207 requirements when students declared in the major(s) are also counting those courses towards the
 208 credit requirements of other declared major(s).
 209

210 A student is allowed to double count courses between or among majors if and only if such double
 211 counting is allowed by all the majors for which the student has declared and towards which the credits
 212 apply.
 213

214 If any department or program for which the student has declared a major and towards which the
 215 credits apply does not have an approved policy that allows double counting of courses between or
 216 among majors, then double counting is not allowed. The student who uses the course(s) to satisfy the
 217 requirements of more than one major must take additional courses as approved by the major
 218 department(s) or program(s) to reach the required number of credits in each major.”
 219
 220

221 **RESOLVED, that as of the Fall 2023 semester, the following policy shall be reflected in the**
 222 **Hunter College Undergraduate Catalog:**
 223

224 “Policy on Double Counting Between or Among Multiple Majors
 225

226 Courses may satisfy the requirements of more than one major. Double counting between or among
 227 majors occurs when a student uses a course or courses to count towards the credit requirements of
 228 more than one declared major. When double counting is allowed, the student does not need to take
 229 additional courses to reach the required number of credits in the major.
 230
 231
 232

233 **Minutes**
234 **Meeting of the Hunter College Senate**
235 **12 October 2022**
236

237 A student is allowed to double count courses between or among majors if and only if such double
238 counting is allowed by all the majors for which the student has declared and towards which the credits
239 apply.

240
241 If any department or program for which the student has declared a major and towards which the
242 credits apply does not have an approved policy that allows double counting of courses between or
243 among majors, then double counting is not allowed. The student who uses the course(s) to satisfy the
244 requirements of more than one major must take additional courses as approved by the major
245 department(s) or program(s) to reach the required number of credits in each major.”
246

247
248 Voting by iClicker produced the following results: 48 in favor, two against, and one abstention.
249 The Resolution failed.
250

251
252 **Grade Appeals Committee**

253 Chair Keating called on Professor Lawrence Shore, member of the Grade Appeals Committee, to present
254 the revised Grade Appeals Procedures. The revised procedures are in Appendix II. During the presentation
255 there were questions and brief discussion.
256

257
258
259 Due to the late hour, the meeting was adjourned at 5:21 PM.
260

261 Respectfully submitted,
262

263 Sarah Jeninsky
264 Secretary
265

APPENDIX I

The following attendance was noted from the meeting

(A) =Alternate, A=Attended, X=Absent, E=Excused

Faculty					
AFPRL	Anthony Browne	X	Mathematics & Statistics	Sandra Clarkson	A
	Milagros Denis-Rosario	(A) A			0
	Lázaro Lima	(A) A		Robert Thompson	(A) A
Anthropology	Jackie Brown	A		Barry Cherkas	(A) A
	Stephanie Levy	(A) A	Medical Laboratory Sciences	Abigail Morales	E
	Milena Shattuck	(A) A		Chad Euler	(A) X
Art & Art History	Harper Montgomery	X		Muktar Mahajan	(A) X
	Chitra Ganesh	X	Music	Michele Cabrini	A
	Emily Braun	(A) X		L. Poundie Burstein	(A) X
	A. K. Burns	(A) A			
Biological Sciences	Ben Ortiz	A	School of Nursing	Carolyn Sun	X
	Jesus Angulo	A		William Samuels	A
	Paul Feinstein	(A) X		Stephen Yermal	X
	Carmen Melendez	(A) X		So-Hyun Park	(A) X
Chemistry	Gabriela Smeureanu	A	Philosophy	Laura Keating	A
	Nancy Greenbaum	(A) A		Frank Kirkland	(A) X
	Brian Zeglis	(A) X		Omar Dabhour	(A) X
	Nadya Kobko-Litskevitch	X	Physics & Astronomy	Kelle Cruz	E
Classical & Oriental Studies	Yasha Klots	(A) A		Yuhang Ren	(A) X
	Fang Dai	(A) A			(A)
	Doron Friedman	A	Political Science	Robert Jenkins	X
Computer Science	Sven Dietrich	(A) X		Lina Newton	(A) A
	Felisa Vazquez-Abad	(A) A		Michael Lee	(A) X
			Psychology	Roseanne Flores	A
Curriculum & Teaching	Laura Baecher	X		Michael Lewis	X
	Stephen Demeo	(A) A		Glenn E Schafe	(A) X
	Debbie Sonu	X		Peter Serrano	(A) A
	Tim Fansworth	X	Physical Therapy	Milo Lipovac	X
Dance	Maura Donohue	(A) X		Jaya Rachwani	(A) A
	Ana Nery Frago	(A) X			(A)
	David Capps	X	Romance Languages	Magdalena Perkowska	A
Economics	Tim Goodspeed	X			0 (A)
	Michelle Liu	(A) A			0 (A)
	vacant	(A)	School of Social Work	Jonathan Prince	A
	Avi Liveson	X		George Patterson	A
Educational Foundations & Cou	Sarah Bonner	(A) X		Marina Lalayants	(A) X
	Jeanne Weiler	(A) A		Keith Chan	(A) X
	Markus Bidell	X	Sociology	Mark Halling	A
English	Sarah Chinn	X		Mike Benediktsson	(A) X
	Amy Robbins	A		Joong Oh	(A) X
	Mark Miller	(A) E	Special Education	vacant	X
	Janet Neary	A		Rhonda Bondie	(A) A
Film & Media Studies	Larry Shore	A		Kathryn Furlong	(A) A
		(A)	SLPA	Donald Vogel	A
	Andrew Demirjian	(A) X		Nancy Eng	(A) X
	Ricardo Miranda	X		JungMoon Hyun	(A) X
Geography & Environmental Sc	Allen Frei	(A) A	Theatre	Claudia Orenstein	X
	William Solecki	(A) X		Louisa Thompson	A
					(A)
German	Elke Nicolai	(A) A	Urban Policy and Planning	Lily Baum Pollans	A
	Eckhard Kuhn-Osius	(A) A		Victoria Johnson	(A) X
	Aine Zimmerman	A		vacant	(A)
History	D'Weston Haywood	(A) X	School of Urban Public Health	Susan Cardenas	A
	Manu Bhagavan	X		Khursheed Navder	(A) A
	Aaron Welt	A		Steven Trasino	(A) A
Library	Iris Finkel	A	Women & Gender Studies	Jennifer Gaboury	X
	vacant	(A)		Catherine Raisignier	(A) X
	Mee' Len Hom	(A) A		Rupal Oza	(A) X

Students

Hunter Moran	A
Umar Faruque	X
Ariadna Pavlidis-Sanchez	A
Isabella Grullon	A
Nicole Palmetto	A
Rida Akhlaq	X
Ronette Johnson	A
Amber Javenero	E
Tabia Ahmed	X
Christopher Orzech	X
Junia Sharmin	X
Ketia Newell	X
Viet Thanh Phan	A
Nourhan Ibrahim	X
Anastasia Villarreal	A
Sultana Wahab	A
Julian Reich	X
Cade Terada	X
Andrew Ackroyd	A

At-Large, Lecturers and Part-Time Faculty

Student Services	Burhan Siddiqui	A
	Luis Roldan	(A) X
Library	Jocelyn Berger-Barera	A
Library	Tony Doyle	A
Psychology	Stefan Schlussman	X
English	vacant	
Medical Lab Science	Hongxing Li	A
Religion	Ron Long	X
Political Science	Rosa Squillacote	X
Special Education	Salvador Ruiz	X
Special Education	Gina Riley	A
Social Work	vacant	
THHP	Sarah Jeninsky	A
Art and Art History	Peter Dudek	X

Ex-Officio

President, USG	Ariana Ahmed	X
Vice President, GSA		0
President Alumni Association	Elizabeth Wilson-Anstey	X
President, HEO Forum	Abdul Hashim	X
President, CLT Council	Amy Jeu	X

ADMINISTRATION

Senators:		
HEO/CLA Representative	Lori Janowski	A
Vice President for Student Affairs	Eija Ayravainen	A
Provost	Manoj Pardasani	A
Dean, School of Arts & Sciences	Andrew Polsky	A
Dean of Education	Michael Middleton	A
Alternate Senators (3):		
Dean of Social Work	Mary Cavanaugh	A
General Counsel & Dean of Faculty	Suzanne Piper	X
Dean of Nursing	Elizabeth Capezuti	E

APPENDIX II

Hunter College Grade Appeals Procedures

(Approved by the Hunter Senate 10/9/85, revised 5/04/2005, 3/25/15, 10/12/2022)

Scope of the Grade Appeal

The grade appeal process is designed to adjudicate the fairness of the final grade a student receives in a course. The appeals committees (see below) cannot alter the grade given by the instructor on a particular assignment. The appeals committee shall consider whether the instructor followed the grading criteria laid out in the course syllabus and whether the grading was arbitrary and capricious. (On occasion, an instructor may have good reason to alter a syllabus; in such cases, students must be informed in writing before the changes take effect.) A grade appeal should be limited to the grade that the student received. Other complaints about a course and/or an instructor should be raised in a timely manner (during the semester in which the course is given) to the department chair or program head.

I. Appeal at the Department/Program (or School) Level

Step 1: Student-Initiated Discussion with Instructor

When a student believes that a final grade was not graded correctly, they must first confer with the instructor, in person (or via Zoom), regarding the accuracy of the grade received. This conference should be held within the **first three weeks of the semester following receipt of the grade**. At this time errors may be corrected.

If the grade is not an error, the student and instructor must review together all class material pertinent to the grade.

Step 2: Student Request for Department/Program/School Grade Appeal

If the student is not satisfied, or if the instructor does not meet with the student within the first three weeks of the semester, the student should promptly contact the Department Chair/Program Director (or School Dean in units with no departments) by submitting a written appeal, a statement that presents the basis for the grade appeal. This appeal must be submitted **within the first five weeks of the semester following receipt of the grade**. The Department Chair/Program Director/School Dean shall be responsible for giving the student a copy of the *Hunter College Grade Appeals Procedures* as set forth in this document.

Step 3: Department/School Grade Appeals Committee and Hearing

The Department Chair/Program Director/School Dean shall convene a Department/School Grade Appeal Committee of three members **within two weeks of receiving the appeal**. The student has the right to request in writing that the Chair appoint a student as a member of the Department/Program/School Grade Appeals Committee. The Committee (if not otherwise specified in the By-laws) shall consist of three full time members of the Department/School faculty, unless the student has requested that a student be appointed as the third member of the committee. The Department Chair shall designate one faculty member of the Committee as Chair, who will be responsible for gathering the pertinent materials from the student and instructor for review by the Committee. This should include the relevant work submitted by the student, the instructor's grading criteria for this course (including the course syllabus), course assignments, and the instructor's evaluation of the work submitted as well as any other pertinent evidence. All materials shall be shared with the other members of the committee.

The Department Grade Appeals Committee must notify the student and the instructor, in writing, that they have the right to appear, separately, before the committee. **Within three weeks of its appointment**, the Department Grade Appeals Committee will convene a closed hearing where both parties have the opportunity to testify separately.

Step 4: Written Report of Decision

After the hearing the committee will render its judgment and prepare a brief written report, written by the chair of the committee with the support of a majority of the committee, explaining the reasons for its ruling, and whether the decision was unanimous,

**Meeting of the Hunter College Senate
12 October 2022**

without mentioning any names or details that might violate confidentiality. The committee chair will submit the report to the department chairperson who will send it to the parties involved. This will allow the losing party to make an informed decision as to whether to appeal to the Senate Grade Appeal Committee.

If neither party appeals to the Senate Grade Appeals Committee within the designated time frame (see below), the department chair will ensure, if required, that a change of grade was submitted to the registrar.

Notes Re: Department/School Appeal:

- a. No grade changes can be made after a degree has been officially conferred.
- b. If the instructor of the course in question is presently a Department Chair or the Director of a program, that person will designate another senior faculty member to form the department/program grade appeal committee and perform the duties otherwise assigned here to the chair/program director.
- c. A letter grade may not be changed to Pass/No Credit, and P/NC grades may not be changed to letter grades unless a student has requested it before the end of the semester.
- d. If a student is appealing a grade from an instructor who is absent the next semester, the chair will endeavor to be in contact with the instructor and gather all the relevant documentation as specified above. The instructor will also be invited to testify remotely

II. Appeal at the Senate Level

Step 1: Initiating Appeal at the Senate Level

In cases in which the student or the instructor is dissatisfied with the decision of the Department/School Grade Appeals Committee, they may appeal to the Senate Grade Appeals Committee. This appeal must be initiated within two weeks of having been notified of the Department/School decision.

The individual initiating the appeal must fill out a *Grade Appeals Form* that is available in the Senate Office--Room HE1018, stating the basis for the appeal. The individual should also submit to the Senate Office for the Senate Grade Appeals Committee all information that they believe relevant to the appeal.

Step 2: Senate Grade Appeal Set Up

Upon receipt of this material the Senate Grade Appeals Committee will request the Department/School to forward copies of the following for the Senate file:

1. Student's initial written complaint to Department Chair.
2. Written notice to student and instructor of right to appear before the Department/School Grade Appeals Committee and the student's right to request that the Department Chair appoint a student member to the Grade Appeals Committee.
3. All materials used by the Department/School Grade Appeals Committee in reaching a decision.
4. The course syllabus.
5. The report sent to the chair and the parties from the Department Grade Appeals Committee on the decision and the basis for it.

Step 3: Senate Grade Appeal Hearings

The Senate Grade Appeals Committee (consisting of 4 faculty members and 3 students with a quorum being 51% of the Committee) will then review all the relevant evidence. The Committee may interview the individuals involved in the grade appeal and other resource persons. It shall notify the student and the instructor of a scheduled committee meeting, thereby providing an opportunity for them to appear separately before the committee.

The Senate Grade Appeal Committee shall confine its consideration to whether the instructor applied the specified grading standards of the course, whether the grade was arbitrary and capricious, and whether the appeal process at the depart/program level was properly followed.

**Meeting of the Hunter College Senate
12 October 2022**

After considering the evidence, the Committee will meet in closed session and will reach a decision by majority vote. All proceedings are confidential. The Chair of the Committee shall inform all parties concerned (i.e. student, instructor, department chair, registrar) of its decision in writing. **The decision of the Senate Grade Appeals Committee is final.**

Notes re: Senate Grade Appeal

- a. The Senate Grade Appeals Committee does not permit department grade appeals to be bypassed. The Senate Grade Appeals Committee reserves the right to send appeals back to the departmental level for reasons of significance (e.g., new evidence or testimony introduced).
- b. The Senate Grade Appeals Committee may not accept appeals (a) in cases where a charge of academic dishonesty is pending, or (b) concerning changes from a letter grade to Pass/No Credit or changes from P/NC to letter grades.

Rationale for Changes in Grade Appeal Procedures:

The rules and procedures for grade appeals must be fair and transparent. The current rules undermine due process. When a department grade appeal committee, through its chair, writes its report explaining the decision, this report is not made available to either party disputing the grade. Only the Department Grade Appeal Committee, the department chair, and the Senate Grade Appeal Committee (SGAC) see it. The student and instructor also need to see the report. This will help them make an informed decision as to whether to appeal or not. Putting together an appeal is time-consuming and it is valuable and reasonable to know why you lost so as to determine the grounds on which to appeal. The department grade committee chair can write the report to protect confidentiality by omitting all names and details of what transpired.

This procedural change will also improve the efficiency of the SGAC process. Currently, the committee hears a number of frivolous appeals because the parties do not know why they lost. In addition, because the party appealing to the SGAC has not seen the report, they usually spend valuable time in the hearings rearguing the case already heard at the department level where the committee has more subject matter expertise. A losing party who knows why they lost will be able to make a more focused appeal. And seeing the report, the student or instructor will be able to learn from the experience and adjust future behavior. Without seeing the department committee's reasons, a student or instructor can lose two appeals and never know why.

This new procedure will also protect against another problem- the overloading of the grade appeal process. In a number of grade appeal cases there are often other issues going on between the instructor and the student in addition to the grade appeal. These often exacerbate the grade appeal, which are not simple to begin with. Because grade appeals are currently so broadly understood, the grade appeal process often becomes a conduit for other grievances and issues that are beyond the purview and capacity of the grade appeal committee and are better dealt with by the chair and other offices at the college. Currently too many issues get channeled into the grade appeal process. Students should not have unrealistic expectations about what a grade appeal committee can do. It cannot regrade a paper but it can ensure that the rules for grading for the class are stated clearly in the syllabus and followed, and that the grading was not arbitrary and capricious.

Changes to the procedures have also been made to generally update this document to provide clarity, efficiency, and corrected language wherever possible.