

Student Fairness Committee
2015/2016 Year-End Committee Report to the Academic Senate

Chair: Susan Murray
 Chair Elect: TBD
 Number of meetings held: 14

SFC Business Completed in 2015/2016
--

The Student Fairness Committee (SFC) met 14 times during the 2015/2016 academic year; 7 meetings in the Fall and 7 meetings in the Spring. The agendas and minutes summarizing the case dispositions are included with this report.

Three petitions filed in 2014/2015 were carried over to the 2015/2016 academic year. In addition to the carry over, the SFC received 32 new petitions, significantly less than the previous year.

AY	New Cases Filed
2015/2016	14
2014/2015	23
2013/2014	9
2012/2013	25
2011/2012	15

One petition will be carried over to Fall 2016 due to the fact that it was filed late in the semester.

Formal Hearings	7
Petitions Dismissed	5
Resolved Informally	2
Petitions Withdrawn	0
Carried Over	1

Student Fairness Case Detail

The SFC findings and recommendations specific to each case are attached in order of case number.

1415-023	Grade Dispute	Humanities & Arts/TA SFC determined that there was no clear and consistent method of
-----------------	----------------------	--

		evaluation. Ruled in favor of student. Grade was changed from D to B+.
1415-024	Grade Dispute	Humanities & Arts/MUS 10A/Fall 2014
1415-025	Grade Dispute	CASA/JS 129/ Fall 2014 Resolved informally with instructor and chair.
1516-001	Grade Dispute	Science/GEOL 3/Spring 2015 Petition dismissed after review by SFC. Informal resolution reached.
1516-002	Grade Dispute	Engineering/EE102/Spring 2015 Petition dismissed after review by the SFC.
1516-003	Grievance	Engineering/ME 106/ Spring 2015 SFC found in favor of student. Grade changed from IC to D.
1516-004	Grievance	Engineering/Computer Eng. Masters Thesis/Summer 2015 SFC found in favor of student. Department accepted SFC recommendation.
1516-005	Grade Dispute	Humanities & Arts /LING 113/ Spring 2015
1516-006	Grade Dispute	Applied Science and Arts/ NUFS 217/ Spring 2015 Petition dismissed by SFC after review.
1516-008	Grievance	Business/ Bus119A and Bus 119B/ Fall 14 and Spring 15 Petition dismissed by SFC after review.
1516-009	Grade Dispute	Engineering/ CE 264/ Spring 2015 SFC determined that there was no clear and consistent method of evaluation. Ruled in favor of student. Grade changed from B- to A-
1516-010	Grievance	Humanities & Arts/ Eng 133 and Eng 135 / Spring 2015 Petition was originally dismissed after review by the SFC due to a Green Sheet Policy violation. The department requested a hearing so a subcommittee was assigned. SFC found in favor of the student and recommended grades changed from A- to A. Faculty rejected committee recommendation. Petition will be forwarded to BAFPR in FA 2016.
1516-011	Grade Dispute	Business/ BUS 162 / Fall 2015 SFC determined that evaluation differed from announced requirements, and did not provide a clear and consistent method of evaluation. Finding in favor of the student. SFC recommended a change of grade from C- to C. Petition sent to instructor and awaiting response.
1516-012	Grade Dispute	Humanities & Arts/ Eng 133 / Fall 2015 SFC determined that evaluation differed from announced requirements, and did not provide a clear and consistent method of evaluation. Finding in favor of the student. SFC recommended a change of grade from F to B. Petition rejected and will be forwarded to BAFPR in FA 2016.

1516-013	Grade Dispute	Kinesiology/Kin30 /Fall 2015 Petition to be carried over to 16/17 year due to filing date
-----------------	----------------------	---

Unfinished Business Items for 2016/2017

Three petitions will be referred to BAFPR for review in Fall 2016 due to rejection of SFC recommendations by faculty involved. One petition will be reviewed in FA 16 due to later submission date.

STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE
AGENDA
 Wednesday, September 2, 2015
 3:00 PM - 5:00 PM
 SSC 603

1. Election of Chair for 2015/2016
2. Review of the Agenda
3. Case Presentation(s)--None

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee

4. Case Updates & Review of Meeting Dates—None

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee	Target Hearing Date

5. Petitions for Review

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent
1415-023	04/21/15	TA 10	F14	04/24/15
1415-024	05/03/15	Music 10A	F14	07/06/15
1516-001	05/28/15	GEOL 03	S15	08/31/15
1516-003	08/09/15	ME 106	S15	08/10/15

6. Cases Awaiting Assignment

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent

7. Other Business

8. 2015/2016 Meeting Dates:

Fall 2015	Spring 2016
9/16, 9/23 10/7, 10/21 11/4, 11/18 12/2	2/3, 2/17 3/2, 3/16 4/6, 4/20 5/4

Student Fairness Committee
Meeting Notes
9-2-15

Present: Scharberg, Cohen, Silberman, Sirkeci, Skrovran, Murray, Santana, J. Gonzales
Absent: Brooks, D. Gonzales, Randle
Notetaker: Skrovran

- Introductions made to two new committee members and explanation of the committee and how it works.
- Susan Murray was elected as chair.

Four petitions to review:

- 1516-003 (Mechanical Engineering, ME106)
- 1415-023 (Theatre and Performing arts, Theatre appreciation)
- 1516-001 (Geology, GEOL3-02)
- 1415-024 (Kinesology, Music 10A online)

Reasons for accepting or rejecting the cases:

1516-003 (Mechanical Engineering, ME106):

Case accepted. Cohen assigned as faculty. Silberman assigned as shadowing faculty. Santana is the student assigned.

Grievance. Student has an incomplete in the class that needs to be cleared by April. Needs the resolution to graduate. No contract to clear the incomplete. Suggested that perhaps this isn't a case for the committee but could be taken care of by a letter from Demerris to see how the student can resolve the incomplete. Another suggestion that since it is a grievance that we should take the case to make sure the incomplete can be resolved in a fair manner. Could mediate to resolve the incomplete. Serving the restraining order is an unauthorized act and the student now fears that his work will not be judged fairly.

1415-023 (Theatre and Performing arts, Theatre appreciation):

Case accepted. Not assigned.

The professor may be grading on attendance and on peer review of performance (unclear). No documentation in the syllabus how that will be assessed. Students cannot be graded on attendance.

Grading rubric for group project is not in the syllabus but is posted to Canvas. It would be helpful to see that to determine if there is mention of students grading each other.

1516-001 (Geology, GEOL3-02):

Case not accepted. Informal resolution suggested. Not assigned.

Green sheet not in proper format. Writing requirement is not listed in the green sheet. We don't know if this case falls to us based on GE writing requirements not assigned and assessed. Susan

communicated that Demerris had the idea of drafting a letter to undergraduate studies cc-ing the associate dean. Not much we can do grade-wise. See what undergraduate studies says.

1415-024 (Music, Music 10A online):

Case accepted. Skrovran assigned as faculty. Sirkeci assigned as shadowing faculty. Gonzales assigned as student.

Some students were allowed to make up assignments and she was not. Student did not have access to assignments the first week of class. Need to investigate to get more information.

**STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE
AGENDA
Wednesday, October 7, 2015
3:00 PM - 5:00 PM
SSC 603**

1. Review of Minutes
2. Review of the Agenda
3. Case Presentation(s)--None

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee

4. Case Updates & Review of Meeting Dates—None

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee	Target Hearing Date
1415-023	04/21/15	TA 10	F14	04/24/15	09/02/15	09/02/15	Murray/	
1415-024	05/03/15	Music 10A	F14	07/06/15	09/02/15	09/02/15		
1516-001	05/28/15	GEOL 03	S15	08/31/15	09/02/15	09/02/15	Not accepted. Informal resolution will be attempted.	
1516-003	08/09/15	ME 106	S15	08/10/15	09/02/15	09/02/15	Cohen/Santana	

5. Petitions for Review

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent
1516-004	08/24/15	Masters Thesis	Sm 15	10/05/15
1516-005	10/06/15	LING 113	Sp 15	10/06/15

6. Cases Awaiting Assignment

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sm	Notice Sent

7. Other Business

8. 2015/2016 Meeting Dates:

Fall 2015	Spring 2016
10/21	2/3, 2/17
11/4, 11/18	3/2, 3/16
12/2	4/6, 4/20
	5/4

Is it more appropriate for this to be resolved by the department/college in conjunction with faculty affairs? As a professional courtesy should the subcommittee talk to the faculty? There are unresolved issues aside from the grade that have to be addressed. Will be referred back to the department/college/faculty affairs.

6. 1516-005, LING 113

The student was re-taking the course for grade forgiveness. What did the instructor mean when he said the decision would be left up to the committee? Misunderstanding of the process.

Cheating cannot be considered by the committee. The student willingly sent the assignment to his classmate. It would make sense for the instructor to tell the student to continue to attend in the event that the sanction was not substantiated. However, he did submit it as an F in the course. Did he communicate this to the student?

Incident date was 3/19/15 and was submitted to SCED on 4/3/15. Faculty did not notify the student and/or did not address the issue with the student in a timely manner. It appears that the faculty member did not communicate the need to meet directly to the student. Faculty wrote a note on the assignment requesting a meeting, but the student was not in class the day the assignment was handed back, therefore student did not receive or read the request to meet. The assignment with the note sat unclaimed in LLD office.

Petition dismissed.

7. 1516-004, Graduate Thesis

Role of advisor is to read and edit. When it was rejected by Graduate Studies, the response from the department was, "They don't like us over here." What effort has there been to get to the root of what that means or why they are having theses rejected so frequently?

Did the student receive appropriate and timely feedback? The thesis was reviewed by the advisor and technical communication instructor. Whose responsibility is it when a student is stuck at this point in the process?

Accepted the case for investigation.

Subcommittee: Cohen and Santana

8. Adjourned: 4:50

Student Fairness Committee
Meeting Minutes
10/07/2015

Present: Brooks, Gonzales, Cohen, Silberman, Sirkeci, Skovran, Murray, Randle, Santana, Gonzales, Najib
Absent: Scharberg
Minutes: Brooks

1. Review and Approval of Minutes—First: Cohen, Second: J. Gonzales, 9—0—2

2. 1415-023, TA 10

Subcommittee is meeting with Faculty on 10/8 and student next Tuesday, 10/13.

3. 1415-024, Music 10A

Scholarship funds were not deposited before the start of the semester so she did not have access to the online course. Instructor records indicate that she had access early in the semester and submitted one assignment, the first one, then missed the next several.

Instructor shared emails between the athletic advisors and the instructor which indicate he responded; the claim alleges he did not. What have we done in the past when the grievance was shown to be inaccurate? Could she have been the subject of fee cancellation? She could have added the class and requested a fee deferral. The first assignment was due early September and that was submitted. The subsequent assignments were due 9/12 and course cancellation was 9/14.

Will send email that she should send additional information by Monday or the case will be dismissed.

4. 1516-001, Geol 03

UGS has offered an informal resolution that could be made to the entire class. If they choose to do so, that is between UGS and the department. That should not involve the SFC if it is informal.

The issues identified in this case and in the conversation with T. Agnos—greensheet, instructor, grading. However, because they were the same for everyone in the course and everyone was graded based on the announced requirements, T. Agnos suggested it is not a fairness issue.

Brooks will follow-up with S. Branz and indicated that he should suggest the remedy to the department and work it out with them.

5. 1516-003, ME 106

Subcommittee met with student on September 16. His complaint is vague in that he is not exactly contesting the grade. He is seeking justice. In his opinion the project wasn't going well and he trashed it. The other student involved in the project filed a restraining order and the instructor served it. There is a tangible complaint to act on and that is why the case was taken. The subcommittee tried to assist in finding a way to resolve the Incomplete but the student is not interested. There is also the issue of the professor's handling of the cheating and the restraining order. The professor offered to assist with clearing the incomplete in a mediated conversation with Brooks and the student said he was not interested.

Student indicated to the subcommittee that he would rather take the class again with another professor than go through the grade dispute process to resolve the current grade.

The situation raises a number of different concerns: plagiarism, professionalism, facilitating a pathway to graduation. There is also a concern that the instructor has filed a student conduct complaint in response to the student's grievance.

STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE
AGENDA
Wednesday, October 21, 2015
3:00 PM - 5:00 PM
SSC 603

1. Review of Minutes
2. Review of the Agenda
3. Case Presentation(s)--None

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee

4. Case Updates & Review of Meeting Dates—None

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee	Target Hearing Date
1415-023	04/21/15	TA 10	F14	04/24/15	09/02/15	09/02/15	Murray/Najib	
1415-024	05/03/15	Music 10A	F14	07/06/15	09/02/15	09/02/15	Skovran/Gonzales	
1516-001	05/28/15	GEOL 03	S15	08/31/15	09/02/15	09/02/15	Not accepted. Informal resolution will be attempted.	
1516-003	08/09/15	ME 106	S15	08/10/15	09/02/15	09/02/15	TBD	
1516-004	08/24/15	Masters Thesis	Sm 15	10/05/15	10/07/15	10/07/15	Cohen/Santana	

5. Petitions for Review

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent
1516-005	10/10/15	NUFS 217	S15	10/13/15

6. Cases Awaiting Assignment

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sm	Notice Sent

7. Other Business

8. 2015/2016 Meeting Dates:

Fall 2015	Spring 2016
11/4, 11/18 12/2	2/3, 2/17 3/2, 3/16 4/6, 4/20 5/4

STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE
AGENDA
Wednesday, November 4, 2015
3:00 PM - 5:00 PM
SSC 603

1. Review of Minutes
2. Review of the Agenda
3. Case Presentation(s)—None

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee
1415-023	04/21/15	TA 10	F14	04/24/15	09/02/15	09/02/15	Murray/Naib

4. Case Updates & Review of Meeting Dates—None

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee	Target Hearing Date
1516-003	08/09/15	ME 106	S15	08/10/15	09/02/15	09/02/15	TBD	
1516-004	08/24/15	Masters Thesis	Sm 15	10/05/15	10/07/15	10/07/15	Cohen/Santana	

5. Petitions for Review

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent

6. Cases Awaiting Assignment

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sm	Notice Sent

7. Other Business

8. 2015/2016 Meeting Dates:

	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
	11/18 12/2	2/3, 2/17 3/2, 3/16 4/6, 4/20 5/4

STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE
AGENDA
Wednesday, November 18, 2015
3:00 PM - 5:00 PM
SSC 603

1. Review of Minutes
2. Review of the Agenda
3. Case Presentation(s)

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee
1516-004	08/24/15	Masters Thesis	Sm 15	10/05/15	10/07/15	10/07/15	Cohen/Santana
1415-023	04/21/15	TA 10	F14	04/24/15	09/02/15	09/02/15	Murray/Najib

4. Case Updates & Review of Meeting Dates—None

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee	Target Hearing Date
1516-003	08/09/15	ME 106	S15	08/10/15	09/02/15	09/02/15	Randle/Morales/Rivera	

5. Petitions for Review

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent

6. Cases Awaiting Assignment

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sm	Notice Sent

7. Other Business—Proposed revision to the attendance policy

8. 2015/2016 Meeting Dates:

Fall 2015	Spring 2016
12/2	2/3, 2/17 3/2, 3/16 4/6, 4/20 5/4

**STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE
AGENDA
Wednesday, December 2, 2015
3:00 PM - 5:00 PM
SSC 603**

1. Review of Minutes
2. Review of the Agenda
3. Case Presentation(s)

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee
1516-004	08/24/15	Masters Thesis	Sm 15	10/05/15	10/07/15	10/07/15	Cohen/Santana

4. Case Updates & Review of Meeting Dates—None

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee	Target Hearing Date
1516-003	08/09/15	ME 106	S15	08/10/15	09/02/15	09/02/15	Randle/Morales/Rivera	

5. Petitions for Review

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent

6. Cases Awaiting Assignment

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sem	Notice Sent

7. Other Business—Proposed revision to the attendance policy

8. 2015/2016 Meeting Dates:

Spring 2016
2/3, 2/17
3/2, 3/16
4/6, 4/20
5/4

**STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE
AGENDA
Wednesday, February 3, 2016
3:00 PM - 5:00 PM
SSC 603**

1. Review of the Agenda
2. Review of the December 2, 2015 Minutes
3. Case Presentation(s)

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Semester	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee

4. Case Updates & Review of Meeting Dates

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sm	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee	Target Hearing Date
1516-003	8/9/2015	ME 106	SP15					

5. Petitions for Review

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sm	Notice Sent
1516-008	11/20/15	Bus 119B	SP15	1/25/2016
1516-009	12/07/15	CE264	SP15	1/25/2016
1516-010	12/10/15	ENG133, ENG135	SP15	1/25/2016

6. Cases Awaiting Assignment

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Instructor	Sm	Notice Sent	Assigned

7. Other Business

8. 2015/16 Meeting Dates:

February 17
March 2, 16
April 6, 20
May 4

STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 3RD, 2016

1. Meeting called to order (after independent review of petitions) at 3:15p.m.

PRESENT: Murray (Chair), Gonzales, Brooks, Sorkhabi, Skovran, Randle, Morales, Majib, Rivera, Castillo

ABSENT: Silberman, Sirkeci

RECORDER: Ramos

2. Introductions

3. The minutes of December 2, 2015 were not reviewed

4. CASE UPDATES

- a. 1516-003: Subcommittee met with student submitting grievance, they are starting to meet with faculty and will reach out to schedule additional interviews with OSCED, Police Department, and parties involved. Recommended to start to reach out and schedule times to meet with all.

5. CASE PRESENTATIONS:

1516-008: Refer the main areas out, not taking the Grade Dispute since case is not made and grade change cannot happen at this point (after graduation)

There are other factors however, not pertaining to the SFC to review: Areas to refer: Faculty Affairs, Accommodations Review Board, Academic Integrity

- College: recommend that Dean of college / Assoc Dean to address personnel issues
- AEC/Accommodations Review Board – Were appropriate accommodations met? Would have to review logs of attendance to confirm times and that is confidential information
- Academic Integrity –
- Faculty Affairs –
- Committee votes there is enough reason for dismissal / To dismiss case:
In Favor – 10; Against - 0; Abstain - 0

1516-009: Committee reviewed syllabus and found it to be out of compliance with Green Sheet standards.

When green sheet says final is specific set of chapters, needs to stay with that, not give specifics then announce it will be cumulative or on one thing versus another; Was there an announcement made that the final was changing? Due to the fact that the committee had more questions that could only be addressed by participants, committee will take case.

- Committee votes there is enough reason to take the case:
In Favor – 9; Against - 0; Abstain - 0
 - Assigned to the case: Nadia Sorkhabi and Efrain Castillo

1516-010: Many areas involved in this petition that don't fall under SFC jurisdiction; Petition is filed as a grievance but needs to be a grade dispute, considering student's resolution sought.

- From the evidence presented, there is no reference to -/+ scales on the green sheet therefore it is not in compliance. Since this policy has been violated, committee recommends changing the grade from an A- to an A (F06-2)
- We also recognize and are concerned that these other issues need to be addressed
 - No need to take the case as policy was violated regarding the grades.

For - 8 - Against - 0 Abstain - 1

Meeting Adjourned 4:45pm

**STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE
AGENDA
Wednesday, March 2, 2016
3:00 PM - 5:00 PM
SSC 603**

1. Review of the Agenda
2. Review of the February 3, 2016 minutes
3. Case Updates
4. New petitions to review
5. Other Business

Case Updates

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sm	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee	Target Hearing Date
1516-003	8/9/2015	ME 106	SP15	--	--	11/16/15	MR, MM, VR	4/6/2016
1516-009	12/7/2015	CE264	SP15	1/25/16	2/3/16	2/3/16	NS, EC	

New Petitions for Review

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sm	Notice Sent
1516-011	2/26/16	Bus 162	FA15	3/2/16

6. Other Business

Review: Draft of Guidelines on Gateway Assignments (College of Engineering)
Review: Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy revisions

7. 2015/16 Meeting Dates:

March 2, 16
April 6, 20
May 4

STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

March 2, 2016

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER: 3:10p.m. (After individual review of materials)

PRESENT: Murray (Chair), Gonzales, Brooks, Sirkeci, Skovran, Randle, Morales, Rivera, Castillo, Khosraviani

ABSENT: Silberman, Sorkhabi, Cohen, Najib

RECORDER: Ramos

Notes from Feb 3 meeting were approved

II. Case Updates :

1516-003– MR, MM, VR: Case is moving forward, meeting with Conduct Office and Faculty involved. The subcommittee is in the process of scheduling meetings with police officers involved– April 6th potential hearing date –

1516-009 - NS,EC: Met with student yesterday, student said he was on probation heading into course, so he was dropped from the grad program – will meet with the professor-

III. New petitions

1516-011 - There is confusion as to how the participation grade is calculated/divided - how much weight did the students' grading of each other carry? How does respect get assessed in to participation and how was participation recorded in the class - How did he come to the 1/10 grade for her participation grade? Is participation only added on after the class?

***If he can't justify the participation we would recommend they re-calculate the grade without participation – it was adjusted and would be a C grade without it**

Motion to take the case: 10 in favor 0 opposed

Assigned to – ES and AK

IV. Discussion of EE101 review/recommendations of Gateway Assignments

V. Other business

- Student Fairness Policy Update - updating Ombudsperson page for students to find information more easily as needed; Greensheet policy @ Academic Senate for revisions
- Potential concerns to bring to Provost and SAVP attention (There is a clear protocol about every avenue on campus to complain except for faculty members; Problematic grading issues with faculty, not enough training for those who are part-time lecturers (participation/grading) – Having clear grading criteria at onset of the semester; Chairs who do not mediate conflict between students and the department and students are left without an avenue to complain or bring a concern without being labeled a “problem child” - What can students do when they're experiencing microaggressions in class?

Meeting Adjourned – 4:55pm

STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE
AGENDA
 Wednesday, March 16, 2016
 3:00 PM - 5:00 PM
 SSC 603

1. Review of the Agenda
2. Review of the March 2 meeting notes
3. Case Updates
4. New petitions to review
5. Other Business

Case Updates

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sm	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee	Target Hearing Date
1516-003	8/9/2015	ME 106	SP15	--	--	11/16/15	MR, MM, VR	4/6/2016
1516-009	12/7/2015	CE264	SP15	1/25/16	2/3/16	2/3/16	NS, EC	
1516-011	12/7/2015	Bus 162	FA15	3/2/16	3/2/16	3/2/16	ES, AK	

New Petitions for Review

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sm	Notice Sent
1516-012	3/4/16	ENGL 133	FA15	3/15/16

6. Other Business

- Review EE 101 response
- Update re: policy going to senate

7. Remaining 2015/16 Meeting Dates:

April 6, 20
 May 4

Student Fairness Committee

MEETING MINUTES

March 16, 2016

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER: 3:15pm

PRESENT: Murray, Gonzales, Brooks, Sorkhabi, Sirkeci, Randle, Morales, Najib, Rivera, Castillo, Khosraviani

ABSENT: Skovran

RECORDER: Ramos

Notes from 3/2/16 not reviewed

II. Case Updates

1516-03 - Have met with student/faculty/conduct; need to push hearing date to 4/20 due to circumstances with officers involved in the report

1516-09 - Have talked to student and professor - Professor denied that he had given any new material. They were told to bring the code book. Student was DQ'd from Engineering due to this B- and was reinstated but he feels that he was lied to. He had good scores on his previous exams (in the 90's) but his final was lower (40's) - Send invites for hearing at next meeting

1516-11 - Have met with the student and interviews are scheduled for next week with the professor and the chair

III. New Petitions:

1516-12 - Found concerns with the greensheet and assignments relating to funds students spend in the class as well as travel.

In Favor of taking the case:

Yes: 11 No: 0 Abstain: 0

Subcommittee: Murray and Najib

III. Other Business

Discussed/revised response to EE101 gateway assignment

Discussed upcoming changes to policy for disqualification appeals (involving the SFC)

Meeting adjourned 4:50pm

STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE
 AGENDA
 Wednesday, April 6, 2016
 3:00 PM - 5:00 PM
 SSC 603

1. Review of the Agenda
2. Review of the March 2 and March 16 meeting notes
3. Case Presentation(s) (Student invited for 3:20pm/Instructor not attending)

1516-009	12/7/2015	CE264	SP15	1/25/16	2/3/16	2/3/16		NS, EC	4/6/2016
----------	-----------	-------	------	---------	--------	--------	--	--------	----------

4. Case Updates

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sm	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee	Target Hearing Date
1516-003	8/9/2015	ME 106	SP15	--	--	11/16/15	MR, MM, VR	4/20/2016
1516-011	12/7/2015	Bus 162	FA15	3/2/16	3/2/16	3/2/16	ES, AK	5/4/16
1516-012	3/4/16	ENGL 133	FA15	3/15/16	3/16/16	3/16/16	SM, LN	5/4/16

5. Other Business
 - Potential of adding meeting on 5/11?
6. Remaining 2015/16 Meeting Dates:
 - April 20
 - May 4

Student Fairness Committee
MEETING MINUTES
April 6, 2016

1. Meeting called to order: 3:00pm, individual review of notes
Present: Gonzales, Brooks, Sorkhabi, Sirkeci, Skovran, Murray, Morales, Najib, Rivera, Castillo, Khosraviani
Absent: Randle
Recorder: Ramos

2. Meeting notes from 3/2 and 3/16 (with edits) were reviewed and accepted
For: 11 Against: 0

3. **Case presentations** (3:15pm)
1516-009 - Student present; Instructor informed he would not be attending the hearing
 - Student shared that the professor did not follow course syllabus and he added material for the final exam (a third more material)
 - Student shared that the final exam was only 2 questions and the professor was not in class during the exam but there was a TA ; In the review for the exam the instructor stressed bringing the code book.
 - The information needed to answer the question on the final was not easily found in the materials that were provided; When he asked the professor where this material came from, the professor said he covered something similar, but he didn't make an effort to show where or how it was covered –
 - Most of the students left the exam surprised by the last question – how could they answer the problem correctly without having the knowledge?
 - A different concrete instructor proctored the exam – class was not curved, but some mathematical manipulation was done
 - Professor stressed an emphasis in the code book – student shared that he did try to talk to the professor, telling him it was unfair, but professor said that if the chair told him to change the grade he would change it; Chair said he wasn't sure why he was talking to him about it as this was a matter between the student and the instructor
 - Student asked to view his exam and there was no response, but he asked the chair to get involved to view scores – took about a month

Discussion

Subcommittee spoke with professor, found it frustrating and professor evasive. It took a long time to get a straight answer for the questions. The professor tried to make Student seem like an uninformed, uninvolved person. Student was experiencing serious personal issues though, not frivolous, and was a good student, with good grades. People who were able to solve problem #2 had practical experience in the field.

The concern is mostly to if students were misled and if the material needed to pass the final was truly covered in the course materials. Student did not get an explanation as to how his final exam was graded.

Why did the professor not identify where he got the question or how a student could find the answer? Is it because it truly was not clear in the syllabus or materials covered in class?

Committee reviewed the recommendation – in order to recalculate we need to see every grade that he got – is the Excel grade calculated in the homework?

Burden of proof is on the student, did we prove that he was misinformed? Was the material truly covered in the course? Chair and Assoc. Dean would have to know. From faculty perspective, accounting for every possible topic covered in class would be terrible, as a faculty member.

Regarding grades, the professor made it so that nobody fell below a B- on the exam. What were grades for others in the class? Method of grading doesn't provide a clear and consistent method of evaluation, if he rounded just to get all students to a B-, that's not fair because some may have gotten 20 points where others got 45. Can we get access to see all of the grades in the class – Student would have gotten a 74.7, but professor said he raised his grade to a B-. How many people did not answer question #2?

Recommendation

1. As the professor was unable to substantiate that the materials were indeed a part of the course curriculum, we feel that the final exam grade is invalid and recommend excluding from final grade.
2. Department needs to address issue of communication; the instructor would benefit from making written announcements about changes to the syllabus as making announcements in class that are different from the green sheet and from the actual exam is misleading
3. The department should encourage faculty to utilize the accessible template for syllabi as it clearly outlines expectations for students and ensures that the grading policy is such that it's a clear and consistent manner of grading. According to current grading policies, the student should know what is expected in the class and should be able to calculate their grade at any point in the semester. The committee feels that this **green sheet violates policy XXXX and it does not provide such information.**
4. Recommendation is to drop the final exam score and use the other two grades to assign an A (based on our calculation he would fall in this range, and since there is no clear cut off range on the +/- scale, we recommend an A grade). We recommend to drop the final exam grade because we asked the professor to substantiate the final grade and he couldn't. In addition, what he provided is that he rounded the grades.
5. The committee is dismayed/highly concerned – 27% of the class received a B-
6. In Favor: 9; Against: 0

1516-003 – Subcommittee reported that they met with the police officers and are not interviewing anyone else at this point, so hearing will be on April 20th

1516-011 – Subcommittee updated; Crux of the matter was participation grade - how it was judged changed from the syllabus and it was announced in class. When asked how participation was calculated, there was no roster or markings of how a student participated were kept. According to instructor, there was no difference between 40% and 60% in participation. Hearing on 5/20

1516-012 – Subcommittee met with student and will be meeting with chair and instructor next week

Meeting to be added on 5/11

Meeting adjourned – 4:45pm

STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE
AGENDA
Wednesday, April 20, 2016
3:00 PM - 5:00 PM
SSC 603

1. Review of the Agenda
2. Review of the April 6 meeting notes
3. Case Presentation(s) (Student invited for 3:15pm/Instructor not attending) - 1516-003
4. Case Updates

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sm	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee	Target Hearing Date
1516-011	12/7/2015	Bus 162	FA15	3/2/16	3/2/16	3/2/16	ES, AK	5/11/16
1516-012	3/4/16	ENGL 133	FA15	3/15/16	3/16/16	3/16/16	SM, LN	5/4/16

5. Other Business
 - Students who wish to continue in SFC next semester/academic year?
6. Remaining 2015/16 Meeting Dates:
 - May 4
 - May 11

STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes

April 20, 2016

- I. Meeting called to order at 3:10pm (after individual review of materials)
PRESENT: Murray, Gonzales, Brooks, Sorkhabi, Sirkeci, Randle (phone), Morales, Najib, Rivera, Castillo
ABSENT: Khosraviani, Skovran
RECORDER: Ramos

Notes from April 6 were read and approved

II. Student Presentation:

- Student was asked for plans related to finishing his degree and he shared that he only has one 1-unit course to complete, along with the class involved in this petition
- Student has not reapplied for admissions, which may be an area of concern since he has taken two semesters off – may be able to take and complete through Open University
- The student asked for clarification regarding information discussed in subcommittee interview that was obtained from the police report
- Michelle said it was from the officer and that they said it was part of the report but they can't confirm because we didn't see the report
- Student was concerned about the way that he was being portrayed in the reports
- Student was asked what he was hoping would come from this hearing and petition. He feels that it is important to alert the faculty that the professor did not follow appropriate procedure related to serving him the court order because now it seemed like he was taking the female student's side
- Student stated that his main goal was to show that a teacher and student sued [served] him falsely
- Clarified that university does not necessarily have a role in that, as information that he sees as important to help him is confidential
- Committee clarified limits of its reach and that it can make recommendations for redress at the university level
- Committee discussed the incomplete and extending the deadline as an option; student is ok taking the class with the same professor but the committee discussed taking it with another professor

Discussion

- It is clear that the student's main concern is clearing his names with the courts, feeling that the university really offended him and allowed policies and conduct to be dismissed
- He was investigated and found that the two students were cheating in the class but nothing happened since the instructor did not bring the claim forward to SCED – Even though they were both found to be cheating, the female student's character is not the purview of this committee
- There was no collaboration between professor and female student- student feels there was collusion and that the professor chose sides but the professor felt obligated to do something for the safety of the student and those in the class
- When the professor met with the student, professor felt that he did not show any remorse for what he had done to the project
- It's questionable why the professor gave an Incomplete instead of an F
- Was there a BIT report filed? If not, instructor should have done so, especially concerning behavior on campus
- Instructor mentioned that he met with Associate Dean and they discussed if she wanted to file a restraining order – such a huge leap when you have other resources on campus

- If instructor felt that either student was acting inappropriately he should have contacted campus entities first
- Did instructor truly make a good faith effort – Why didn't he meet with them right then and there if he knows there's already a problem with the group? He should have done a better job of getting them together, i.e. Invitation to meet should not have been open ended – professor should have set a time and place

Recommendation

- Student be given a grade for the course, considering his work up until the submission of the final project and that his project grade be the same as the group's grade, considering the restraining order precluded him from completing the course
 - Address cheating happening in class and policies regarding academic integrity
- Vote:** Yes – 10 No – 0 Abstain – 0

III. Case updates

1516-012 (Susan/Lana) - Hearing date 5/4/16

1516-011-(Betsy/Armon)- Hearing set for 5/11/16

1516-010- (Susan/Lana)- Hearing set for 5/11/16

Meeting concluded at 4:45pm

**STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE
AGENDA
Wednesday, May 4, 2016
3:00 PM - 5:00 PM
SSC 603**

1. Review of the Agenda
2. Review of the April 20 meeting notes
3. Case Presentation(s) (Student invited for 3:15pm/Department rep at 3:45pm)

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sm	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee	Target Hearing Date
1516-012	3/4/16	ENGL 133	FA15	3/15/16	3/16/16	3/16/16	SM, LN	5/4/16

4. Case Updates

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sm	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee	Target Hearing Date
1516-011	12/7/2015	Bus 162	FA15	3/2/16	3/2/16	3/2/16	ES, AK	5/11/16
1516-010	12/10/15	ENGL 133	SP15	1/25/16	2/3/16	4/20/16	SM, LN	5/11/16

5. Other Business
6. Remaining 2015/16 Meeting Dates:
May 11

STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes

May 4, 2016

- I. Meeting called to order at 3:10pm (after individual review of materials)
- PRESENT:** Gonzales, Brooks, Sorkhabi, Sirkeci, Skovran, Murray, Randle, Morales, Najib, Castillo, Khosraviani
ABSENT: n/a
RECORDER: Ramos
- II. **Student Presentation - Case 1516-012**
- Student feels he is being graded unfairly and that random accusations were made against him
 - Student was asked if he has discussed his concerns with the instructor. He said yes, that he approached instructor when he was accused of lying about his internship and when they were attempting to expel him from the program
 - Student was accused of threatening classmates and he had to attend a formal conduct hearing with SCED; SCED dismissed the case as there were no formal submitted reports, reason to believe he was a threat
 - Student was asked that if he felt he was moved due to criticism of fellow classmates' work. He responded that he felt he was moved because initial station in the class was swamped, so he was moved to fiction station
 - Student shared that they were not given any criteria to assign grades for participation
 - Student was asked why or how each student was assigned submissions to review as it was noticed there were varying numbers of submissions for each student. Student was not sure how they were assigned but shared that he had asked for more, because he knew some undergrads were not able to manage more submissions
 - As a grad student, he was not given any different expectations or authority in class
 - Q: How many classes do you think you missed? About 3; Student was, however, at one point early on, told not attend class or police would be called in; He continued to go to class on advice of David Bruck
 - Police did come to class but it was more of an informational session than in response to the student
 - Student was asked about instructions for article reviews. Student shared no instructions or guidelines were given as to what was acceptable and what wasn't; also did not have a specific number to meet in order to get a good grade
 - Q: What about the other two assignments that you turned in that you got 0's on? Apparently she didn't grade them – The marketing report and the Journal presentation were oral reports
 - Instructor had already removed student from the roster and he had to insist on giving the report; He didn't have a term paper ready because instructor said that they were oral reports but many students didn't realize they were written reports; He turned in written reports by final grade period
 - Q: Did instructor take role in class? Yes, she did; David advised me not to answer because she clearly knew I was there (about 40 people in class)
 - Q: Can you explain the marketing project and implementation? Student made suggestions to improve circulation, making a recommendation to a small chain in SF but the Instructor accused him of not doing the assignment
 - Student explained how he worked on the marketing project but was not sure what further implementation he could have done; he was able to get confirmation that he did speak to the bookstore
 - Q: Were you able to pick another magazine? No, it had to be Reed Magazine
 - Q: Were there guidelines as to what success means? None, not on the green sheet and none was ever discussed
 - There was one paper that student had written and she did not include that grade in to the final grade at all
 - Q: If you were to assign yourself a grade what would it be and how would you justify that grade? "A B- or higher because she had already graded some of my work as a B- and because group lead had assigned an A for participation"

DISCUSSION

- Student did make inappropriate/harsh comments about students, harsh feedback, but would that have been a time to address this specifically – what instruction did he have about the appropriate way to provide feedback?
- Instructor/Chair were holding this student to an expectation that they had never set, so then it all became about how to get rid of him but there was never a BIT or SCED report. They were not straightforward with what had happened to cause their concern
- When subcommittee met with instructor, instructor said that the grades were in her head, tracking participation; There was no consistency in method for grading
- Comment from interview with instructor was "How can we put everything that we teach in the syllabus?"; Syllabi are not in the appropriate template
- If they had concerns about his behavior, they should have filed something in the initial semester; Student was not given examples of what was offensive and why they could be viewed as such – this could have been a teachable moment
- 30% of his grades are two 0's but there are no records kept and one assignment that is graded was not being considered a part of the grade (according to instructor)

- The UPD presentation was how to report if you feel unsafe – this was proposed because they were still pushing for expelling him
- Syllabus has a section where it mentions attendance affecting grades
- While each assignment was mentioned in the syllabus, no guidelines were provided to complete the assignments
- One of the pieces that he solicited was used in the magazine
- Instructor did not give a date to present, because she wanted to get kick him out of the class; Clearly he did some work, but was not provided a grade or written comments

RECOMMENDATION

- There is enough evidence to warrant a 'B' based on what was presented
 - Highlight concerns about Syllabus and environment – providing clear guidelines for students and due dates
 - Clarify what "implementation of marketing project" means on the syllabus with examples of what is acceptable
 - In favor of accepting the recommendation and the grade change to a B
- In Favor: 8 Against: 0

Notes from 4/20 were reviewed and approved

Case updates- 1516-11 and 1516-10 – student and instructor plan on attending 5/11 hearing

Meeting adjourned 4:50pm

STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE
 AGENDA
 Wednesday, May 11, 2016
 3:00 PM - 5:00 PM
 SSC 603

1. Case Presentation: Case 1516-11
 - a. Student – 3:05pm (confirmed attendance)
 - b. Instructor – 3:20pm (sent info, hasn't confirmed as of 5/10)
 - c. Discussion

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sm	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee	Target Hearing Date
1516-011	12/7/2015	Bus 162	FA15	3/2/16	3/2/16	3/2/16	ES, AK	5/11/16

2. Case Presentation: Case 1516-10
 - a. Student – 4:05pm (confirmed attendance)
 - b. Instructor/Chair – 4:20pm (confirmed attendance)
 - c. Discussion

Case #	Date Filed	Course	Sm	Notice Sent	Reviewed	Assigned	Subcommittee	Target Hearing Date
1516-010	12/10/15	ENGL 133 ENGL 135	SP15	1/25/16	2/3/16	4/20/16	SM, LN	5/11/16

3. Closing/New Business
 No remaining meetings 15-16 academic year

STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes

May 11, 2016

I. Meeting called to order at 3:00pm

PRESENT: Gonzales, Sorkhabi, Skovran, Murray, Randle, Morales, Najib, Castillo, Khosraviani, Rivera

ABSENT: Brooks, Sirkeci

RECORDER: Ramos

II. Presentation - Case 1516-012

Student

- Student was counting on the group project for her participation points 10 % was from doing the outside workshop - not on the syllabus
- Group members graded each other and my group ended up with 3 of us doing the work; Under participation on green sheet, it seems that the way to assess participation changed
- There was no prior breakdown of progress throughout semester, only saw participation grade at the end. Instructor did not take attendance or collaboration in class he didn't make a priority to collect any work done in class ; Chair of the department was not familiar with process and did not facilitate a conversation

Instructor

- Students were aware criteria changed in first week of semester; this was announced in the class. It seems that those who did not attend class were the ones who didn't understand. Expected students to share info within groups.
- Changed grading criteria for participation in order to benefit the students- originally assigned as group to include individual grade, but let students know that everyone starts with 0 and students' responsibilities to earn participation points
- Instructor did not document interactions with students, but knew who came to office hours because there were only 2-3 that came; No records kept because it depends on the individual; It depends on the individual's need / characteristics - if each individual achieved something in those areas, I gave them points. It was difficult to come up with a spreadsheet for this concept - developing cultural intelligence - different students have different challenges -
- Out of 45 students only 7 students regularly participated in class - If student doesn't participate, there's nothing I can do; Instructor did not provide updates about progress, but made announcements stating that if they hadn't participated in office hours or events on campus they were not doing well
- This particular student didn't come to office hours or outside at campus events, no emails from her, never contacted about participation grade - no essays, nothing; Instructor had 77 in classes last semester- He added the new participation options to this syllabus

Discussion

- Method for grading participation subjective and open to bias
- Students need to be accountable and attend class but he didn't clearly or consistently document participation
- Student needs to go to class and professor needs to document participation more clearly
- If you're going to change the grading criteria for the class, it needs to be communicated
- Open to bias in the lines of gender, age, race , because those who stand out the most will be noticed
- **Subcommittee Recommendation:** That student's grade be recalculated without factoring in participation which would change grade from a D (65.6%) to a C- (71.8%).

In favor of subcommittee's recommendation:

For: 7 Against:0

III. Presentation - Case 1516-010

Student

- Student was asked to teach 3 of the classes; felt that lines were blurred of student/instructor role; Often experienced cross over in the 135 class
- Instructor's comments were that she expected more from graduate students, but there was no distinction between grad/undergrad expectations mentioned/discussed
- Age was brought up in a case with a student
- Student only confided in Ombudsperson for fear of retaliation before reporting
- Student feels she did a lot of work for magazine/class; Instructor appointed leaders for group, but student feels that student did not do a good job and thought it wasn't fair
- A change student recommended to facilitate the process for grants was taken into consideration for this semester; Last thing that was odd, she was asked to sign legal documentation for funding future
- Feels that instructor was angry with her, because it was never clarified that she was being held to different expectations - shouldn't this have been A+ work? Seems odd that had received A's before, and now two A-'s... Feels it was retaliation

Department Chair

- Chair appealed the decision but instructor would have done the same; Chair delivered a statement and handouts relevant to grading. "Only way to be fair, is to change all of the grades of the class" since the department uses this scale now
- Grade was not capricious - bulk of grade is determined by student leader; Student leader said this student was "competent"
- Q: Who determines the leader's grade? A: Assuming the professor determines that grade
- Q: Why doesn't the instructor assign all of the students' grades then? A: Because they do work in groups (grant writing, poetry, fiction) Difficult for professor to review the interactions
- Q: Is 70% of the grade based on what an undergraduate submits to the instructor? A: Yes, but students know this from the beginning
- Professor gave A's for both sections of the course, followed the suggestion of the student for 133; In the case of 135 - student said she never got a grade communicated
- Q: Why did she receive a B? Was it due to quality of work or because her father passed/ Chair assumes that it was the quality of work
- 133 grade - Due to student evaluation
- 135 grade - Seems consistent with her review of grades
- Q: Allegation of hostile environment - was investigated? Chair shared that yelling was from student, in one case, had to start in a disciplinary action; Faculty Affairs decided that the accusations were not supported
- Q: Was there a claim submitted to conduct? Chair met with SCED to discuss the issue, but didn't want to go that route - asked student not to return to class and sign agreement
- Instructor for these courses was not aware of these behaviors and chair did not share these happenings with her
- Has never seen students talk about instructor in this way on SOTES and she gets some of the highest scores in the department
- Q: Is it appropriate for a student to be determining 70% of the student's grade? A: If evaluations seemed fair and based on fact; point is that the claims of grades being capricious/malicious treatment are not valid - if she was being malicious, she could have given her a lower grade
- Q: Is it possible that the team leader blamed the failure to secure a grant for magazine on team members and assigned a low grade to help his own? Yes you run the risk that someone could be thrown under the

bus - there was no response to the team leader - Did the team leader get the same grade? - not sure -
Instructor does not assign the same grade to the group

Discussion -

- Previous case where we discouraged the group giving a large percentage of the grade
- Especially when they're not given a rubric; No clear criteria
- 70% of the grade being graded by an undergraduate is egregious
- Subcommittee Recommendation:

133 - Change grade to an A because 70% of the grade was given by another student
without guidance on what to look for/how to grade

135 - Change grade to an A, based on greensheet policy violation of using +/- markers

Favor: 9 Against: 0

IV. Meeting notes from 5/4/2016 read and approved

Elected SFC Chair for 16/17 - Nadia Sorkhabi, College of Education

For: 9 Against: 0

Meeting adjourned at 5:05pm