28 September 1998

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: Senate Council Office

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting , Monday October 12, 1998. Proposal to amend <u>University Senate Rules</u>, Section VI - 6.1.3

<u>Proposal</u>: [add underlined word]

6.1.3 ACADEMIC EVALUATION (US: 12/5/83)
A   Students have the right to receive grades based only upon fair and just evaluation of their performance in a course as measured by the standards announced by their instructor(s) at the first or second class meeting.

B   Students have the right to receive a fair and just academic evaluation of their performance in a program. In addition to the student's overall academic record, evaluation may include the assessment of such activities as research and/or laboratory performance, qualifying examinations, professional board examinations, studio work or performance activities, behavior in professional situations, or interviews to determine continuation in a program. The program faculty and/or relevant administrative officer must inform the student as to which activities will be included in the academic assessment no later than the beginning of the activity to be evaluated.

C   Evaluations determined by anything other than a good faith judgment based on explicit statements of the above standards are improper. Among irrelevant considerations are race, color, religion, sex, national origin, sexual orientation, age, <u>disability,</u> marital status, and political affiliations, or any activities outside the classroom that are unrelated to the course work or program requirements. (US: 2/11/85)

<u>Background and Rationale</u>:
The omission of <u>disability</u> from 6.1.3C is apparently inadvertent. The effect of the omission is negligible because the Academic Ombud has the authority under the Board of Trustees policy to deal with discrimination complaints by students with disabilities. This revision would simply bring the rule in line with actual practice.

<u>Implementation</u>: Immediate

US Agenda Item: USR: VI-6.1.3, Academic Evaluation