

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
NEWARK, DELAWARE
19711

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
303 HULLIHEN HALL
PHONE: 302-738-2829

May 12, 1976

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Faculty

FROM: Byron P. Shurtleff, Vice President
University Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Special Senate Meeting, May 24, 1976

Byron Shurtleff
EPC

In accordance with Section VI, paragraph 6(2) of the Constitution of the Faculty of the University of Delaware, a special meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Monday, May 24, 1976 at 4:00 p.m. in room 110 Memorial Hall.

The purpose of this meeting will be to consider the following agenda items:

- A. Recommendation for provisional approval of the Master of Instruction degree program in the College of Education, from the Coordinating Committee on Education (L. Mosberg, Chairperson). (Attachment)
- B. Graduate Student Grievance Procedure, from the Committee on Graduate Studies through the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges (R. Geiger, Chairperson).
- C. Election to resolve a tie in the voting for a second member of the Committee on Committees.
- D. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of the Senate of April 5 and 12, 1976.

The provision of the Constitution of the Faculty dealing with special meetings states:

"The call of a special meeting shall state the purpose or purposes of the special meeting and no business shall be transacted other than that specified in the notice of the meeting."

BPS/b

Attachment: Proposal for Master of Instruction Degree Program

PROPOSAL FOR A MASTER OF INSTRUCTION DEGREE PROGRAM

Program Title: Master of Instruction Degree Program

Degree Name: Master of Instruction (MI)

Program Purposes: To provide a structure through which the professional advancement of inservice teachers in Delaware may be met and allow the University of Delaware to expand its role in inservice teacher education. (The problems of inservice teacher education in Delaware and other states are discussed in Appendix A).

Specifically, the proposed experimental program will provide:

1. Inservice educational opportunities for Delaware teachers which satisfy concerns for:
 - a. updating information in the field to provide the possibility for expanding their knowledge base;
 - b. improving classroom teaching skills through learning experiences which are relevant and directly applicable;
 - c. gaining professional credit and certification for participation in teacher improvement programs.
2. Opportunity for the University of Delaware to develop an additional vehicle for
 - a. extending much needed services to the Southern Delaware area;
 - b. engaging in a constructive role in organizing and bringing focus to inservice education in Delaware.

Admission. Certified* classroom teachers teaching in the Delaware region will be eligible for admission to the program. An Advisory committee, chaired by the program coordinator and with a member from each of the College's departments, will evaluate applicants to the program on the basis of their record of academic achievement (undergraduate performance), letters of recommendation from supervisors which attest the applicants' teaching ability, tenure status, and value to the school, and a letter from the applicants which indicates a career commitment to teaching and the areas in which they propose to improve their teaching skills in the MI program. The Advisory Committee or

*The "certified" requirement will apply to those applicants who hold positions in educational institutions which require certification. In the event an applicant is teaching in an educational institution which does not require certification, (e.g., community colleges) evidence that the person has taught in that institution for one year and has been contracted to continue will be required.

its chairman may interview applicants. The committee's admission recommendations will be forwarded in priority order to the Graduate Dean, via the Office of Graduate Studies in Education.

Up to nine hours of graduate credits obtained from institutions recognized by the University of Delaware under normal transfer procedures may be applied to the student's MI degree program. Such credits must be consistent with the student's planned program and are subject to content review by the student's advisor and the Office of Graduate Studies in Education.

Retention. Students must have a grade index of 3.0 to be eligible for graduation. Participation in the program must be terminated if the overall grade index falls below 2.5. For the most part, this means that every C must be balanced by an A. Courses in which less than a C grade is earned are not counted in the 30 hours of the program, although they are still counted in the grade index.

Program Completion. Candidates must complete the equivalent of 30 University credits of instruction with an index of at least 3.0. In addition, candidates must have the second requirement for a portfolio of individual projects approved by their evaluation committee (see below). Preceding this final evaluation, the performance of MI candidates will be evaluated through means specified in the Appendix B.

Program Content. The program requirements will be established by the advisory committee for each of the three targeted population areas (elementary, secondary, and community college). The program for elementary teachers is currently being planned by a committee of Nevin Frantz, John Gaynor, Jon Magoon, William Moody, and Wesner Stack and will contain a balance of required core and elective study. An important feature of the program is the compilation of a portfolio of educational products that represent the student's academic achievement and growth. The portfolio provides the basis of the final evaluations for the degree by an evaluation committee of the advisor and two other graduate faculty members. Examples of items a portfolio might normally contain would be:

1. examinations and term papers from courses and mini-courses.
2. design of curriculum units.
3. development of lesson plans
4. development of instructional innovations (program instruction units, demonstrations, films, graphics, etc.).
5. completion of evaluation project.

Program Development. A summary of Program Procedures for MI candidates may be found in Appendix B. Another purpose of the MI program is to provide a continuing inservice program in the Delaware region through the establishment and maintenance of Teacher Centers. At present these exist through Del Mod for mathematics and science. A discussion of how the experimental MI program relates to other College of Education and University goals and programs can be found in Appendix C.

Projected Development Plan for Elementary Education Target Population in Lower Delaware. The time line below indicates the student enrollment limits and successive developmental stages of the program in elementary education. It can be seen that the number of students to be served will eventually reach a maximum of 120 students. It is estimated that the average program completion time will be 3 years. Therefore, assuming favorable program evaluation, a fourth group would begin the 1979-1980 school year maintaining the maximum 120 students per year enrollment. It should be noted that these estimates are based on current university resources available, and changes in the level of such resources would necessarily require MI program adjustments.

Table 1

Schedule of Development for the MI Program

	<u>1976-77</u>	<u>1977-78</u>	<u>1978-79</u>
Class 1 (Location 1)	40	40	40
Class 2 (Location 2)		40	40
Class 3 (Location 3)	—	—	<u>40</u>
	40	80	120

Projected Locations for Courses. The concentration of courses in specific school areas will maximize the impact of the University's inservice development efforts. Agreements for locating courses and other supportive services (see following section) will be made with school units interested in such a cooperative arrangement. It should be noted that locating courses in a specific district for a particular year does not indicate that only those teachers in that district are eligible for enrollment in the program. Admissions will be recommended by the Advisory Committee as indicated, irrespective of place of employment.

Teaching Centers. The program through this means will provide continuing inservice support to teachers beyond the Master's degree through the vehicle of teacher centers. These centers initiated through the program coordinator, but headed by school personnel, will be developed initially as a supportive component of the MI program. It is intended that subsequently they will provide the basis for continuing the school's

inservice and staff development programs. As can be seen in Table 1, the MI course offerings will be targeted in successive years to various school locations in the state. Efforts will be made during the period when the MI program courses are centered in that area to identify potential leaders of inservice education and provide these personnel with training relating to inservice education and staff development. This would include assistance in developing financial means to continue such programs. Subsequent University involvement would arise from requests of district coordinators to provide additional resources or services on a needs basis for the continuing inservice program.

Program Finance. Course offerings for the program will be supported initially through Continuing Education resources. This would include faculty salaries, travel, and instructional supplies. At present, the salary of the program coordinator is part of the College of Education budget. Eventually, program success will merit additions to the College of Education budget, or reallocations within it, to support the program.

Evidence of a Clientele for the Program. There is evidence of a clientele for University courses in Southern Delaware in the Continuing Education survey conducted in the spring of 1975. In this survey 20 percent of the teachers from six Southern Delaware school districts responded with requests for specific courses. It might be noted that the frequency of responses in nine categories constitute sufficient numbers for supporting a regular class. In another survey taken in the Cape Henlopen School District to assess support for a program similar to the one proposed, 43% (40 of 92) of the total number of teachers (in grades K-6) surveyed responded and 85% (34 of 40) of this group responded yes to the question, "Would you be interested in enrolling in such a program?". Thus, there seems to be considerable support for University programs in the Southern Delaware area and this trend is accentuated if programs specifically directed toward teachers' needs are offered. The fact that only 18.8 percent of the teachers in Sussex County and 18.5 percent of the teachers in Kent County (vs. 31.4 percent of the teachers in New Castle County) currently have Masters degrees additionally gives evidence of a potential clientele. Further clientele may be drawn from instructors in the Kent, Sussex, and New Castle branches of Delaware Technical and Community College and areas of Maryland, Pennsylvania and New Jersey adjoining Delaware.

Potential clientele survey data is not available at this time for Kent and New Castle County teachers; however, as only 18.5 percent of the Kent County teachers have Master's or above degrees, a similar clientele in terms of absolute numbers of teachers may exist in those areas. The MI program would be open to all qualified applicants regardless of their place of employment.

APPENDIX A

THE PROBLEMS OF INSERVICE EDUCATION IN DELAWARE AND OTHER STATES

The Problem

The needs to which this program addresses itself are those of inservice teachers. In providing service directed towards those needs, the University of Delaware will be formally expanding its role into an area of increasing concern to educators throughout the country. Harris and Bessant (1969) list several reasons why inservice education is a necessary part of the educational system:

1. Preservice preparation of professional staff members is rarely ideal and may be primarily an introduction to professional preparation rather than professional preparation as such.
2. Social and educational change make current professional practices obsolete or relatively ineffective in a very short period of time. This applies to methods and techniques, tools and substantive knowledge itself.
3. Coordination and articulation of instructional practices require changes in people. Even when each instructional staff member is functioning at a highly professional level, employing an optimum number of the most effective practices, such an instructional program might still be relatively uncoordinated from subject to subject and poorly articulated from year to year.

Local school districts, state departments of instruction, colleges, universities and other agencies have attempted to meet these concerns in various ways including post graduate programs, workshops, professional consultants, administrative supervisors, etc. There have been, and still exist, difficulties inherent in these approaches. First, most of these approaches are short term interventions, often responding to pressing needs of the moment or to the desire to incorporate the most recent educational innovation. The impact of these programs while apparently great initially, tends to fade unless continued support and impetus is provided. Very few inservice programs provide this long-term support. Second, post graduate programs, as an aid to improving inservice education, provide less support than they might due to the admission requirements and other factors such as travel, the theoretical orientation of many programs, and the time structure of most post graduate programs.

Third, most of these approaches tend to take a deficit, as opposed to growth, orientation toward the individuals they serve. As Jackson (1971) perceives it, the defect point of view, "Begins with the assumption that something is wrong with the way practicing teachers now operate, and the purpose of inservice training is to set them straight--to repair their defects, so to speak (p. 21)." The growth point of view, on the other hand, is one in which the individual is provided with resources and experience by which he or she can grow as a teacher and "practitioner of the art." Fourth, although all of these approaches are used, often in the same situation, there exists a large degree of uncoordinated efforts. As Bush (1971) stated, "Much of the current paraphernalia and practice in inservice education has grown up haphazardly and without a coherent rationale over a half century or more (p. 38.)" Without some coordination of resources and continuation of services, there is little doubt inservice education will provide no more assistance to the individual teacher in the future than in the past.

The proposed program is directed toward the needs of inservice teachers. Specifically these fall in separate categories:

1. Certification and advancement. It is the nature of current certification requirements with accompanying advancement through salary grades to require teachers to provide evidence of competence through college and university coursework. In terms of salary increments a teacher with a Master's degree in the state of Delaware may earn \$1,000-1,500 more per year than a teacher with only a bachelor's degree. While increments are paid by the state of Delaware for credits up to 30 over the bachelor's, further advancement is precluded without the Master's degree. For instance, a teacher may not be paid for a bachelor's plus 60 credits, but a significant increase is given for a Master's plus 30. In effect, this places an unusual hardship on certain groups of teachers, due to their location in the State, competing demands and admission requirements. With respect to the latter, it is interesting to note that college graduates with poor grades do as well as those with good grades in job success terms (Kohlberg, LaCrosse and Ricks, 1971; Jencks, et al., 1972).
2. Updating information. An increasing amount and variety of resources are becoming available to teachers. For example, in the affective area, recent research by Kohlberg has given rise to a moral education program which has been successfully used in Boston (Mass.) public schools (Fenton, 1975). Programs suggested by Brown (1974), Confluent Education, and Simon and his coworkers (1972), Valuing, are also recent innovations in affective education to which teachers probably would not have had exposure through their preservice preparation. The utilization of these resources is often hampered by the fact that teachers are unaware of recent developments or lack information regarding their use and place within the overall teaching approach being used. Moreover, it may be unreasonable to expect teachers, faced with the increasing "knowledge explosion" to remain current without continued support.

3. Improving teaching skills. Many educators have written that undergraduate education is not adequate in itself to prepare and maintain teachers for their teaching careers (see Rubin, 1971). As the previous quote from Harris and Besant indicated "preservice preparation of professional staff members is rarely ideal and may be primarily an introduction to professional preparation rather than professional preparation as such." It is reasonable to expect continued growth on the part of teachers subsequent to their entering the profession as they move from the general undergraduate preparation to specific teaching situations. This continued growth in skills, however, may not be spontaneous considering other demands placed upon teachers and may only occur with continued and various support.
4. Desire for relevance in inservice experiences. The enthusiastic response to teacher centers across the country (Yarger and Leonard, 1975) gives evidence of teachers' desire and support for programs which encourage and permit teachers to engage in activities which relate directly to their classroom functions. The proposed program, though not conforming to many features inherent in the "teacher center" approach, contains some of the more successful characteristics such as assessment of teachers' needs, provision of short term workshop type courses, and an interactive, clinical format.
5. Considerations for Southern Delaware Teachers. Teachers in Southern Delaware experience all the general difficulties outlined above and additional specific ones as well. The distance from Newark is a strong deterrent to continuing in post graduate degree programs. Although considerable progress has been made through Continuing Education and the Del Mod Resource Systems to provide course and program possibilities for Southern Delaware teachers, there remain considerably fewer University related inservice options for these teachers than for their New Castle County counterparts. It is interesting to note that 31.4 percent of the teachers in New Castle County, while only 13.8 percent in Sussex County and 18.5 percent teachers in Kent County have Master's or higher degrees (See Table 1 below). Most of the University of Delaware's Master's degree programs which are able to offer a wide variety of course selections in Dover, Milford and Georgetown are those which would qualify the teacher for essentially nonteaching positions (e.g., administration, counseling). It may well serve the best interests of children and other citizens of Delaware to encourage outstanding teachers to remain in the classroom through programs such as the one proposed, rather than influencing their exit from the classroom with advanced nonteaching degrees. It is proposed that this program, while initially focusing on Southern Delaware teachers is also an appropriate program for many other teachers in Delaware and surrounding states and should be offered to these teachers as well. The progress of the program is therefore seen as a developmental process in which course options open to all teachers will be first made available in the "need" areas and then expanded to other areas which the program may serve.

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM PROCEDURES FOR CANDIDATES

1. The candidate, after applying and being admitted to the program meets with an advisor and establishes a program of study. The candidate identifies area of interest and focus for his/her program.
2. The advisor draws up a preliminary contract which outlines the program and the required and optional courses to be taken, contains suggested overall evaluation procedures, and a tentative schedule for advisement and program completion. This contract is then submitted to the chairmen of the Advisory and Evaluation Committees for approval.
3. The candidate then takes courses as indicated, satisfies individual area requirements, individual course evaluation procedures, and progresses to completion.
4. Completion of the master's degree occurs when all requirements have been satisfied. These include:
 - a. Satisfactory completion of the program course requirements.
 - b. Satisfactory completion of the requisite credit hour equivalents.
 - c. Review of the participant's portfolio by the evaluation board.
5. It should be noted that all "mini-courses" and workshops offered through the program will be open to anyone who desires to participate in them. Credit toward the Master of Instruction degree and other University Master's degree programs, however, may be obtained only by those participants who have formally entered a University graduate program and who have secured the approval of their master's advisor for the particular course.

APPENDIX C

THE RELATIONSHIPS OF THE MI PROGRAM TO COLLEGE OF EDUCATION GOALS AND OTHER UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE PROGRAMS AND SIMILAR PROGRAMS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

How Program Goals Relate to College and University Goals. The goals of the program relate to the College of Education and University's goal of providing quality educational experiences for the citizens of Delaware. In terms of specific priorities of the College of Education, this program is directed toward the high priority given inservice and graduate education programs by the College of Education faculty, specifically:

1. To continue development and revision of programs that are responsive for changing needs of professional personnel.
2. To redefine graduate admissions policy in such ways that the diverse needs of the profession are recognized.
3. To establish liaison with other campus divisions and colleges to assure effective utilization of resources for teacher education.
4. To support professional development centers in cooperation with the State Department of Public Instruction and school districts to provide new opportunities for the continuing education of school personnel.*

Relationship of the Proposed Program to Other College of Education and University Programs. The proposed program is visualized as maintaining a close, reciprocal relationship to other College of Education and University programs. This would include the use of present courses offered by these programs in MI students' individual programs where appropriate, providing MI courses as options within other College and University programs where appropriate, and the use of University resources not available within the College of Education.

Initial contacts with Dr. George Borden of the Speech and Communications Department and Dr. Bryan Hansen of the Theater Department have been made, and possibilities relating to mutual support of those departmental programs and the MI program have been discussed.

*Goals and Priorities of the College of Education, University of Delaware, 1975.

Comparison and Contrast of Program with Similar Programs in Other Universities. Although it is impossible to find other university inservice programs identical in nature and functions to the one proposed, a great deal of interest has been generated in the last few years in efforts involving cooperative inservice programs. These programs have been conducted in whole or in part by universities, state departments of instruction, local school districts and other agencies. (Yarger and Leonard, 1975). The type of program, though varied, has come under the general categorical term, teacher center. Most programs offer support to the inservice teacher and many use modifications of the British teacher center as a model. Although British teacher centers and many American programs have a permanent facility as a focal point, it seems more accurate to say that "there appears to be an emphasis upon finding out what educators need or want and how to get these to them (Yarger and Leonard, 1975, p. 5)." While not all "centers" offer academic credit for participation, many do offer credit for courses offered, and some contain the advanced degree option of the proposed MI program. Most "centers" seem to combine a number of services all designed to assist the classroom teacher. Some have begun to investigate preservice and postgraduate links, providing continuity to and relating preservice teacher education to inservice teacher education (e.g., McLeod, 1975).

Some teacher educators (Edelfelt, 1974) predict that the major focus in teacher education for the next decade will be on the professional development of teachers through inservice education. Haring and Crowell (1975), however, warn that such a movement will necessitate change on the part of cooperating agencies. They write specifically of the role of higher educational agencies, "unless colleges and universities are willing and/or able to modify aspects of their programs and procedures, they are in danger of being left behind or being bypassed completely in providing for the professional development of teachers (1975, p. 2)."

Table 1*

Educational Levels of Sussex, Kent and New Castle County Classroom Teachers

	% LTB	% Bach	% B+30	% Mast.	% M+30	% Doct.
Sussex	3.9	74.9	7.4	9.9	3.7	.2
Kent	3.0	72.3	6.2	14.1	4.4	.0
New Castle	1.3	58.8	8.5	21.1	10.0	.3

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

STUDENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

With additions (in italics) as proposed by the Graduate Studies Committee

I. Justification and Background

The 1975-76 Student Guide to Policies describes in detail the procedures by which the faculty and other members of the University community may initiate disciplinary action against students for alleged violations of the academic honesty or social responsibility codes. No formal procedures exist, however, by which students can seek remedies against faculty members for alleged mistreatment. Students may, of course, complain informally to their instructors, chairpersons, and even deans about what they believe to be unfair grades or other forms of abuse or exploitation. We have no way of estimating the effectiveness or extent of this informal complaints process, though the petitions for grade changes processed by the Committee on Undergraduate Records and Certification may give some indication. Each year about 450 (464 in 1975-76) student petitions are channelled through the deans' offices to the appropriate working-level subcommittees of this Committee. Each subcommittee consists of Dr. Robert Mayer, Director of Admissions and Records, a representative of the Provost's office and a representative of a dean's office. The subcommittees attempt to mediate agreement in cases where disputes over grades concern academic judgment. They change grades in cases where assigned grades can be regarded as procedural mistakes. Our Committee believes that this process has worked well so far, and should be continued with two minor changes. Proceeding on the basis of uniformity and equity, it saves both faculty and students from mistakes that arise out of ignorance of complicated or revised grading rules and procedures. But, as a committee consisting solely of administrators, it does not, and should not, make binding decisions in cases involving more than procedural error. What is needed is a system that will handle complaints beyond the purview of the Committee on Undergraduate Records and Certification.

This need was brought to our Committee's attention by Associate Provost Halio in connection with his role in coordinating the efforts of the Task Force on Self-Evaluation of Title IX and the Ad Hoc Committee to Recommend a Student Grievance Procedure. We were the more ready to look into the question because the Committee on Student Life indicated that it wished at least to "postpone involvement . . . until such time as more specific objectives have been defined and a more concisely described task may be referred for consideration and action. . . by the committees already at work on this assignment" (Branca memo, 1/19/76). Our Committee has attempted to define those objectives and outline a procedure for achieving them consonant with the faculty's welfare and privileges as well as students' needs. Our Committee has formulated the proposals below in the belief that the faculty should have the central role both in drafting and in implementing any student complaint procedure. In particular we have been careful to provide procedures that are consonant with two basic principles. First, faculty members have the sole right to assign grades to their students on the basis of academic judgment, although non-academic criteria should not be used in determining

grades. Second, when students complain that instructors have used non-academic criteria in assigning grades, or mistreated them in some other way, it is chiefly the responsibility of the instructors' colleagues of the teaching faculty, and most immediately of their departments/units, to decide whether or not such complaints are well-founded.

II. Definition of a Student Complaint

Student complaints fall into two categories, those involving grades and those involving other matters.

1. Grade complaint: a claim that a grade is unfair because of a faculty member's bias or because of a faculty member's failure to follow announced standards for assigning grades, but not because of a faculty member's erroneous academic judgment (i.e. not a claim that course standards are too high, reading is too heavy, the grade curve too low, etc.). Proper remedies for such kinds of "unfairness," as it affects whole classes, are the use of the drop system in the short run and boycott of courses in the long run.

2. Other complaints: a claim of abuse, ill-treatment, or exploitation involving the irresponsible or unjust misuse of the instructor's position of authority, power, and trust (e.g. pointed sexist or racist slurs, or sexual or pecuniary blackmail).

III. Procedure

1. A student with a complaint against a faculty member must first try to reach agreement with the faculty member concerned.

2. A student whose complaint is not resolved in Step 1 may then appeal to the faculty member's chairperson, who will attempt to mediate the complaint.

The following will apply for undergraduate students:

3. A student or faculty member who is not satisfied with the decision reached in Step 2 may appeal through the chairperson to the department's "Academic Judgment and Student Complaints Committee." Each academic department/unit shall designate such a committee of at least five (5) members, one or two of whom may be students, by creating a new standing committee, by appointing an ad hoc committee for each complaint, or by adding the function of hearing student complaints to an existing committee (e.g., an undergraduate studies committee).

4. A student or faculty member who is not satisfied with the decisions reached in Step 3 may appeal to the Faculty Welfare and Privileges Committee of the University Faculty Senate. This Committee, on reviewing the case, may uphold the decision of the department committee without a hearing or it may agree to hear the appeal. For the purpose of hearing appeals, the Committee will consist of its regular members and two (2) students named each academic year, one by the Nominations Committee of the University of Delaware Coordinating Council and one by the College of Graduate Studies. The decision of this Committee shall be final.

The following will apply for graduate students:

3. A graduate student or faculty member who is not satisfied with the decision reached in Step 2 may appeal through the chairperson to the department or college's Graduate Committee. If such a committee does not exist, the department or college may designate such a committee of at least three members, one of whom may be a graduate student.

4. A graduate student or faculty member who is not satisfied with the decision reached in Step 3 may appeal to the Graduate Studies Committee of the University Faculty Senate. This Committee, on reviewing the case, may uphold the decision of the department or college committee without a hearing or it may agree to hear the appeal. For the purpose of hearing appeals, the Committee will consist of its regular members and two graduate students, nominated by the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies and confirmed by the Graduate Studies Committee. The decision of this Committee shall be final.

5. The student and/or the faculty member may be assisted by an advisor of his or her choice from among the members of the University community and may call witnesses when deemed appropriate by the individual or group hearing the complaint or appeal. In such cases, all individuals involved must be notified of this at least three days before the hearing of the complaint or appeal.

Upon being notified of a complaint by the student the faculty member must meet with the student to discuss the complaint within ten (10) working days. Any appeal of the decision made as a result of this meeting must be made to the department chairperson within three (3) working days of the procedure unless (1) other arrangements are made which are mutually agreed upon by all those involved, or (2) extreme circumstances preclude adherence to such time intervals. In addition, all appeals must be made in writing, and all decisions must be rendered in writing to all parties to the dispute.

IV. Remedial Action Where a Student Complaint is Upheld

1. In the case of a grade complaint, the decision at any step of the procedure may authorize the Records Office to change a grade, unless the decision has been appealed.

2. In the case of other complaints, the decision at any step of the procedure may be, if feasible, a remedy for the aggrieved party or parties. In addition to reporting its findings to the parties involved, the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges, or the Graduate Studies Committee in the case of a graduate student, may forward a copy of its findings to an appropriate administrative officer or faculty body.