

Present: EVP (Academic Affairs) Tan Tai Yong, Director of Academic Affairs Navin Raj, Dean of Faculty Charles Bailyn, Vice-Rector Kate Sanger (Committee of Teaching, Learning and Advising), Regina, Scott and Ross

Date: 31 March 2016 5-6.30pm

Note-taker: Regina

Summary

In this meeting, EVP Tan and others met with representatives of the Student Government to explain the thinking behind the Latin Honours. In summary, this began with a recommendation from the Committee on Teaching, Learning and Advising (TLA), which was based on several months of research and subsequently debated by the faculty in meetings. Once approved, it moved to senior administration and then was approved by the Governing Board. CIPE staff familiar with the Singaporean job market were also consulted.

This was a more than year-long process and certain factors were considered: how to distinguish academic excellence in students and have the Latin Honours be a positive rather than negative indicator, how to minimise academic competition in Yale-NUS while allowing the Latin Honours to reflect how a student stands relative to his/her peers, fairness to different majors, distinguishing Yale-NUS students. Other student concerns were also raised by the Student Government and addressed at the meeting.

Moving forward, there will be a President's Town Hall on April 12th to discuss this policy and other academic affairs, and EVP Tan will shortly release an FAQ to students explaining the policy in greater detail.

Transcript of discussion

topics/aspects of student concerns have been bolded for easy reference

EVP Tan: The way in which this policy was **communicated** was not what we had intended to do. The original plan was to announce and explain the policy at the start of the next academic year. But Octant had a scoop on this and wanted to do a story earlier. They wrote to me to ask for an interview on this Honours Classification system. Rather than having Octant write a story when the facts were still not known, we decided to release the policy to the whole student population. That's how it came about in the way it transpired. It's not ideal.

Rightfully, students are concerned because they have not heard an explanation. And that's why we're meeting with you. We have crafted a FAQ document—why honours? what we're trying to achieve? etc. This will go out to the student body soon and then we will have a town hall. We'll do it on the 12th, we'll invite all students, will discuss other policies too. It's a bit late in the term but it's as soon as it can. The FAQ document will be with them by then, hopefully we will have a full story. We'll also do the original plan, announce it again at the start of the (next) academic year.

How this policy came to be framed. At the outset we wanted to introduce Latin honours classification because it's an important aspect of the degree structure. It took us a while to come up with what would be distinctive, while recognising the academic achievements and

excellence of students who have done well. (VR) Kate sat on two of the Committees for Teaching Learning and Advising. It took more than a year for the committees to come up (with a recommendation). They've considered all options. They did research on local and overseas (mainly American) universities while drafting this document. This document then had to be passed through faculty, and voted on. It then had to be approved by the College governing board because it's part of a degree structure. It was a very involved process. You could ask why students were not involved at the early stages? Part of the reason was because this was a degree requirement and therefore had to be an institutional. We haven't had a graduating class and no student government (then).

Things have changed now and the long term plan is that we will want to start engaging students. Soon, we will have students going out to work, giving us feedback on whether this works or doesn't work for us. This is also part of a larger scheme, now that we're almost at a steady stage, with student groups and student govt. We're going to see how we are going to bring students into the various committees that we have. Things are a little bit more stable and we can start involving students.

While students were not consulted, the questions that we have so far received were not surprising because these were the very questions we've been grappling with in the last two years. Why CAP? Why Latin? Why relative as opposed to an absolute CAP cut-off? What would employers be thinking about? All these were discussed at great length and in great detail.

As you would expect, with **academic excellence** there will need to be a ranking. We can't give Latin Honours to everyone. A cut-off would work if we could moderate or curve every module, but if you don't do that, you're going to have numbers swinging very wildly at the end of 4 years. (If there is) no Latin honours then everybody gets an honours and there's no way of telling who are the better ones. It's a 4 year honours programme, everybody gets honours anyway.

Why Latin—we thought about making Yale-NUS **distinctive** compared to NUS, NTU. We thought if we had to follow the NUS classification, it might be difficult for employers to distinguish our graduates from NUS graduates. Latin honours is also widely used in top US universities, and this would be good for those going on graduate schools in the US. I want to hear from you later on why some students don't like the Latin nomenclature.

Whether this would disadvantage students. I consulted colleagues and they tell me that **employers** do not blindly follow. They're going to look quite carefully at your transcript, your program, where you come from, size of your college. They'll understand differences very quickly.

We looked at the **distribution between majors**, we didn't want a situation where one major would dominate and others suffer. We have a cap for each major to ensure distribution and take into account grading differences and different sizes. We find that it would be fairest to recognise student achievement across 4 years. In a nutshell this is what we were trying to achieve from this classification.

Dean Bailyn: One thing to note about this is the experience of American universities. Many places had absolute GPA cut-offs and grade inflation, 80-90% of students were getting honours. **You want it to be a positive indicator for those who get it and not a negative indicator for those who don't.** That isn't what we want it to do. One of the things that has happened is that institutions have been switching from absolute standard to some kind of relative classification, which means you don't have to keep evaluating it all the time as grading standards evolve.

The thing that hasn't worked out **in the US that there are significant disadvantages in majors.** At Yale, over half of those who major in English get honours and almost none in Physics. This is problematic. We do a better job than Yale at keeping the different grading systems within our College in sync. I think we're better off but there was a lot of anxiety from those of us who emerged from US, don't want different majors to have starkly different standards and to have some that are disadvantaged.

Another thing we didn't want to do is enforce **grade distributions in small classes.** Because if your classes are small that starts to be a huge problem. If you have 15 students in a class it's entirely possible that one class may be significantly better than another and you'll want not to force the 7th best person to necessarily have a B or B+. The larger the class size gets, the easier it is to predict (grade distribution). We also have faculty members coming in from a variety of places, and in the early years we had some problems with grading differences in CC, but from a purely statistical POV this has improved. Every semester we show the faculty overall grading statistics and this pushes people back to the mean. But we don't want to legislate that, inappropriate for smaller classes. In the absence of such legislation you have to let it flow a little bit. This is a kind of compromise between all these different things. There was discussion to have a more complicated system where you compare strength of the schedule in some way, you could come out with elaborate algorithms, some put on the table but in the end we decided we couldn't do any of that. Too complicated. Has to be simple enough so that CIPE can brief and explain to employers.

On the naming thing we **didn't want to have the same names at NUS.** If you start having honours, high honours, that's a complicated place to be. I think there is something we have to watch out for mapping. If people start to map cum laude onto honours, and magna cum laude onto high honours, that's probably inappropriate. I can understand why people (students) are anxious about that. What we have to do is explain what we're doing and why we're doing it. The relative simplicity of the system will be good. The educational landscape is becoming more diverse. SMU uses Latin because they didn't want to embed themselves into the existing. Educational landscape changing.

EVP: So maybe Kate, you can explain why not absolute cut-offs.

VR Sanger: One of the goals was coming up with a system that works for our unique student body that's going off to different places. So much historical insight from different institutions and knowledge of the educational market was brought to bear on this. This was

a very richly thought out decision that brought in a lot of stakeholders, it wasn't an impulsive decision imported from one institution.

These honours are meant to **recognise a very specific kind of achievement—cumulative academic excellence**, not excellence in major, capstone, as a human being or community builder. We wanted to keep it bounded, didn't want to deprive students of the opportunity to demonstrate or be recognised in achievements in other areas. If you have a student who is a great community builder, but a mediocre student, if you lump all of that into one category, that person never gets recognition. We wanted to make sure we space those out the more different kinds of students can get recognition.

Bailyn: It was unfortunate that we weren't able to roll this out with other kinds of recognition are on the table. There's going to be prizes for capstones in every major, that will be a different kind of recognition. It's unfortunate that we weren't able to roll those out together.

Sanger: The initial plan was to wait for the senior class, which is the class most affected by this directly would be able to see the constellation of opportunities. While also not wanting to create a school culture where it's all about gold stars and recognition.

Sanger: To Prof Tan's point about how to make this less competitive. We talked about a lot of different options with models out there. **As much as possible the goal is to create a system which recognises achievement without cultivating competition, a sense of zero-sum me-versus-you.** That's why we rejected some models that exist at some other schools such as an annual, publically reported Dean's List (which we don't use). We thought that would cultivate even more of this sense of competition that I know students are concerned about. With these Latin Honours recognition is only at the end of your college experience. If you diverted so much brainpower to figure out class standing, not likely to bear fruit. I think what's going to happen over time is that people won't pay attention to this in their day to day lives, it will be something announced at graduation. Some people will get expected results, some will be shocked, others might be disappointed, but because as Dean Bailyn said it's a positive indicator for those who get it not a negative indicator for those who don't it won't be shame on my family that I didn't get honours.

We can talk about why not we have no honours, on a pragmatic level. But my sense is that more anxiety is why aren't we doing this like the NUS side. **To say that we are creating a more competitive system than NUS's absolute CAP cut-off system is to ignore the fact that at NUS almost every class is curved, so competition is built in throughout.** We tried to extract that curving from individual classes and offer some acknowledgement of ranking at only at the end of your college years. But you really can't do that kind of translation-CAP to honours translation-if there is no curve, unless you want the Latin honours to mean nothing. It offers no new information if I know your CAP and immediately know your honours status. We wanted to minimise competition but provide valuable information to the student, their families, employers, graduate programmes and such.

EVP: Now we want to hear your questions. The first question I want to ask if are there some students who just don't like the use of *Latin* honours so what was the basis of their objections?

Ross: Confusing and antiquated. I don't think this is representative. Concern is more on employment.

EVP: Until we get people graduating, going out, experiencing difficulties and not getting jobs and seeing they are discriminated because of the class of honours they get, this is actually one of those fear issues that has no basis at this point in time. **But I want to assure our students that once we have this in place, part of our work is to implement it in the student body but the other part of the work, which is just as important, to reach out to employers.** We need to keep pushing the point that they've got to look at Yale-NUS students differently from NUS, SMU students. We are a small cohort, our students do a CC which is very unique here. This is the kind of messaging that we need to get outside so they can see the distinctiveness of students and not end up clumping our students together with other universities. That's part of our work, that's part of CIPE's work. This is something that will be ongoing as we roll this out.

Sanger: All transcripts come with a key from Registry, that explains certain things like ungraded first semester. That's pretty standard as education has become globalised, there's a recognition of increased diversity. Part of it is a word of mouth campaign, but it's also going to come with a **transcript from Registry**. Secondly, when you look at the statistics coming from admissions office, for students coming to Yale-NUS a lot of the other choices they had were international schools. If they were graduating from those schools they would not have an NUS based honours system. I don't think there will be a worry there. I think we can give credit to hiring staff that they understand different schools work differently. **The committee (for Teaching Learning and Advising) met with CIPE and CIPE staff who have deep knowledge of the Singaporean employment context to check some of our assumptions on this.**

Scott: The problem is not the long term but the short term. **The matter of expectations going in. Junior class managed their CAPs with certain assumptions because this were not addressed earlier.** They've come to junior year expecting the administration is not going to announce something crazy, but they have. Perhaps doing this earlier would not have a been a bad idea.

Bailyn: Don't disagree with that.

Sanger: Can I ask about that. Is that students who worked less hard than they would have, or students who worked harder than they needed to. I'm hearing 'my whole plans are all in disarray', I want to know what choices were made so I can help students through this fallout.

Regina: From what I know, some might manage their CAP and decide if they were to continue in a demanding extracurricular. If their CAP was 4.1, and they were aiming for a

second-upper, they would continue with the extracurricular, but if they had realised that the cut-off is much higher because it's 35%, then they would drop that extracurricular.

Scott: The juniors especially having done a lot to build the community, it would be logically hard to argue that that doesn't come at some expense to your grades.

Bailyn: But from that POV, a relative system is appropriate. If a lot of people have taken a grade hit, then everything moves down. relative should be fine.

Scott: For the first year that would be true but as time goes on, those who continued to build community in later years while others dropped off to focus on CAP would be disadvantaged as their classmates dropped out to focus on classes.

Sanger: Having a change is going to be disruptive and emotionally perplexing. At the same time, **I would say that a lot of our research suggested that, especially for the bigger companies which seem to be a source of concern, where people feel like they won't have time to look at us as individual snowflakes, they pretty much run CAP cut-offs rather than honours status cut-offs.** This is in part because they are receiving applications from graduates of many different institutions all over the world which use different honours classifications. It is also because at many schools honours is not conferred until graduation and these companies receive applications from students mid-way through their senior year. For a lot of them—you enter your CAP. CAP matters a lot.

Scott: Another concern is that honours rank is tied to certain **pay grades.**

Navin: I used to be in the civil service. The civil service used to pay a slightly higher salary to holders of the highest level of honours such as First Class, Summa Cum Laude or Highest Distinction. I recall that other levels of honours didn't matter significantly for salary.

EVP: We have a senior member of the Ministry of Education sitting on our Gov Board. I remember when I presented this to him and there were some questions precisely about whether civil service would understand. He was pretty confident and said that the civil service is now quite nuanced and will be able to spot differences quickly and tell the context. Until such time that students feel that there is evidence that despite getting high CAP but are not in the top 65th percentile, and they are being discriminated against, then we will have to respond. But at this point it is just guessing that this is going to happen.

Our scale (size of cohort) is just very different—are you going to compare their honours with that of other schools, with much larger cohorts? Employers are more sophisticated than that. For those in the private sector, many companies don't even care about whether you get Honours; they want look at your whole CV. I concede that some parts of the civil service are still very traditional. The first-class honours is still very important if you want to be a perm sec at some point. But gradually I see that loosening up, they're looking at holistic packaging.

EVP: In the end the honours degree is just one area of excellence. Now everybody is talking about holistic excellence, such as communication skills, leadership, etc. Employers also know that sometimes there is no correlation between pure academic excellence and that kind of package. I know this is not a consolation for students who are all very anxious about getting jobs. Let's wait and see. But at this stage this is fear about something that has not happened yet. It's not unanticipated and we are confident that we have done our research. We've spoken to employers, people in ministries. They tell us that this College is only 200 graduates, if the students are good, nothing to worry about.

Scott: May I suggest that include in the FAQ some info about how you're selling this externally. If I buy into that, I'm more willing to buy into the rest of the argument. Does SMU have the same summa magna...

Regina: They use CAP cut-offs.

Navin: Not really equivalent.

Regina: With SMU graduates in the end they just put '**equivalent to NUS honours rank**'. What are the implications of that if our students do that?

Sanger: No, they are used on a very different basis. It would undermine the distinctiveness of your education and designation of honours for us.

Bailyn: I understand the fear is that there is pre-screening, but CIPE didn't seem too worried about this. (Pre-screening by honours) would be an issue. One thing to keep in mind about this is that you don't have any honours at all until you graduate. This was a deliberate feature.

Sanger: From our research, companies with computer **pre-vetting** screens are more likely to ask for your CAP than your Honours Classification because different schools use different languages and on a computing level it's more difficult to sort people by letters. They also thought that it was quite possible that many ministries and larger companies are more likely to weigh our graduates against other smaller colleges.

Navin: As an example, I teach Foreign Policy and Diplomacy at the College, and the MFA has given me an email address for my students, if they're interested, to email MFA to apply for a position. The fact they are willing to engage with a Yale-NUS instructor and go beyond the standard MFA application process is a testament to the calibre of our students and employers' awareness of the uniqueness of a Yale-NUS education.

EVP: Increasingly, I am hearing that companies are hiring their own interns. The trick is not simply to aim to get a first-class degree but to get into an internship early enough. But I know our students feel stressed that we constantly harp on them to do internships, but sometimes these things do matter. Through internships, prospective employers get to know you as a whole package, rather than just by your grades.

Bailyn: And that's what happens in the US too. and actually what's getting you into the internship is your extra-curriculars. The way you get recognition is complex and it's evolving.

Ross: Outside of professional context in terms of **grad school**, how will our honours system affect admissions.

Bailyn: For PhD applicants, no relevance whatever. From my own experience, I look first at certain key courses they have taken and I look for at least one A and if there's a C that's all right, if there's a lot of Cs...not so much. It's a threshold range rather than a cut-off. Also letter of recommendation.

Sanger: A very safe-playing student that only takes classes they're going to get As in is not going to get the kind of letter of recommendation that a PhD vetting committee is going to get excited about, versus student who strove, took upper-level courses.

Regina: Other concerns I want to raise. In terms of jobs, FAQ needs to reassure students that enough research has been done on this, CIPE is in on this.

How it affects **academic competitiveness**. You argued that because this is only at the end, and we don't have curves at every class, this doesn't affect competitiveness. But the feedback that we're getting, which is of course hypothetical, students are saying that this will affect what majors they select, whether it incentivises students to take easy-A classes because ultimately it's a relative curve, and not pursuing capstones that require collaboration.

Bailyn: Capstone. There's a whole **other set of recognition prizes** that's going to occur around the capstone. From the point of view of Latin Honours, capstone is two courses, but for other things it's the whole thing. That will be rewarding other kinds of virtues. On the majors it was precisely in recognition that some majors will be easier, that is why we have this. We divided by.

EVP: On majors. It was precisely the recognition that some majors may be perceived as easier subjects to get higher scores that we have decided on a cap across all majors so there will be a fair spread of upper-class representation in all areas. We don't want a situation where students in one division end up scoring higher than those in others. We considered dividing by division but not by major, but that was not enough—within each division you could still have one subject dominating.

Regina: Does that **favour smaller-sized majors**?

Bailyn: This is why there is this curious 60% or 6 cap, because when you get below 10, percentage cut-offs don't make any sense anymore, in fact small number statistics because so small that you could easily have a major of 5 students where all of that get latin honours, or a cohort where none of them get. By the time your major size is below six there is no constraint anymore.

Sanger: I want to clarify that I'm not arguing that the system creates no sense of **competition** but we were mindful of creating a system that did not create maximal competition, wanted to mediate that as much as possible.

If students choose a major that they are less passionate about because it's easier, this will affect the quality of their capstone, they will likely write a lacklustre capstone compared to one they felt passionately about and therefore put more effort into. To some extent, students need to make a choice about what they want to get out of their education. Because this system is about every person in your cohort, all the grades they've gotten over 4 years, an individual's ability to game the system is pretty low. To spend 4 years of college making choices to get into the upper 5% or 15 or 20%, that wouldn't be a great use of time. We can say some things to reassure but it's also a choice up to students to think about what they're getting from there. Students in other schools operate on similar systems and I think when this is in place for a couple of years, no one is going to fixate on the competitive fixture. It's just not going to occur to you.

Bailyn: There are a few situations in which that kind of competitiveness comes to the surface, pre-med etc. One of the things we try to do to mitigate that emphasis here is like the first ungraded sem.

Regina: For students who really do want first-class honours, and they're asking if the school can **release CAPs at the 65th percentile**, 95th percentile etc. So they can know where they stand.

EVP: So give at intervals, each semester, what the CAP ranges are for each class?

Sanger: In the absence of an absolute honours scheme, everyone gets to say they can't provide their latin honours classification until graduation.

EVP: Even if you say for planning purposes, let's say you do it for your sophomore year, and when you add another 5 modules the grade distribution will shift. It's not a good indicator and will be misleading if we indicate at that point what the top 95th percentile looks like, because it will move. This is exactly the kind of thing that will cause stress.

Regina: How will it be calculated for **DDP law**?

EVP: They graduate 1 year later, so the agreement is to use cut-off CAP for their admission cohort. They get two degrees. The Yale-NUS one will be based on respective modules they took in Yale-NUS. They will be grouped as Law major.

Regina: Back to the concern about how we'll compare to NUS, especially at the start when you might apply to an employer who doesn't know about Yale-NUS. Someone suggested if we can feature the Yale-NUS Latin Honours on the YNC **transcript**, but the NUS honours on the NUS degree certificate?

EVP: What students do not know is we are still deciding the **certificate** and the transcript. The design of certificate is still being crafted. 'Yale-NUS College' will feature prominently on the certificate. Still in discussion. NUS will have to feature of course because signatory will be chancellor of the university. This is already a concession that they have granted to Yale-NUS.

Transcript will not be a standard NUS transcript but a Yale-NUS transcript being designed. And straightaway employers will know that this is something different, and the transcript will have an answer key explaining about the Yale-NUS curriculum.

Regina: You also said just now that there will be some reconsidering of the policy once some classes graduate?

EVP: Even in NUS, old institution, every few years you get feedback from employers. It could be the other way around, where employers could be telling us that even our summa graduates aren't good enough, and are only good at scoring in subjects. We will adjust when we come to it. E.g. NUS Law Faculty recently expanded the number of first-class honours given out. [Other changes in NUS discussed] Cumulative assessment is fair, but we don't want pressure of having grades curved every module. NUS students hate it. But if you want an absolute cut-off you have to control the numbers if you give honours or designations that mean something.

Sanger: But we also want to look out for students who want excellence academically. There are some students for whom the number one priority throughout college has been their academics.

Ross: Can I clarify the rationale for the **35% number**?

Bailyn: That number bounced around a bit. Series of discussions and Gov Board made ruling on that. It's based on the idea that there is a tipping point around there—where if you have more honours than that it becomes a dishonour not to get an Latin honour. The exact number...Yale for example has it at 30% rather than 35%

Sanger: We consulted with motivation theory. If you google gold stars and education, whole literature on how at schools where almost everyone gets a gold star for showing up, it really means it's terrible to not get one. It reduces everyone's hunger for learning and growth. We were mindful of this in our educational culture.

Bailyn: Same with other areas of recognition at graduation. We're mindful of that, we hope we'll get it (number) right. For the record, Class of 17 has an advantage due to smaller class size (because they have a higher chance of getting a prize). Because the Class of 17 feels acutely their pioneer status, there are some perks.

EVP: Response to Scott's point earlier about some in Class of 17 feeling aggrieved, because they were operating on assumption of NUS' system. There's no change of system, we were developing it and this is the first **time** we've announced it. It took us a while to get this because we wanted to get it right. We could have rushed out a system but all those

things we thought of would not have been considered. We involved more people with different views, and asked a lot more questions. As a latecomer to the scene we've got the benefit of wisdom of all the existing systems and there are things we wanted to avoid. We decided let's do it properly but let's do it in time for first batch to graduate. But I guess it is not what some students want to see, but we're prepared to explain it to them..

Regina: To clarify, what was the **timeline** for this?

EVP/Bailyn: You see, we are in third year of operation. We started talking about this in the beginning of Year 2. Took about a year or so. We could have just taken something from NUS, tweaked it a bit and voila. But I remember having so many discussions on this, 2 or 3 full faculty meetings, then it got shifted back to committee from faculty. We needed faculty to buy-in as well, they had very strong views. It wasn't just committee, Dean of Faculty or me. Gov board.

Bailyn: It went all the way up, and there (Gov Board) we have people from the Ministry of Education, high-ranking people, people from the private sector. They asked these questions too.

Sanger: I hope you understand that the people who made this policy very much want you to get jobs you want to and are qualified to get. Not interested in creating a system that makes it harder for you. They're interested in making a system that benefits everyone as much as possible and recognising a very particular kind of achievement—academic excellence—in students.

Regina: Is there a timeline for the **certificate** and what it will look like?

EVP: Graduation in May of 2017. EVP Doris is chairing Graduation Committee looking at all this things. This College is not even 4 years old, we have to do everything in this short period of time. [Discussion on College mascot and complication of coming to an agreement on something distinctive]

Ross: Concern that our policy did look on surface level like **Yale's**

Bailyn: The major controls. We didn't start with the Yale models. Committee thought of all the models, came up with this model and said—oh, this looks like Yale's, we should check out what happens in Yale. We were instantly appalled because of the issue of the difference between majors. Used this lesson and that's why major caps installed.

Regina: We also got some feedback that people were worried about the **lack of standardisation for Common Curriculum courses** when they took it. Like for FOS courses, someone who is lucky to get a module which she is better at could get a better grade?

Bailyn: I think there are 2 levels of concerns. One, worry that different sections might have different grading standards. Something we studied with some care. Perhaps a problem in

one or two cases. Now we have pretty robust grade distribution section-to-section within CC. And retroactive S/U option was given to Class of 2017 because of that reason.

Foundations of Science is different issue, different content within system. However FOS has a particularly robust grading verification system which makes all sub seminars have similar grade distributions.

I don't think there's a problem with grades but issue with first iteration of QR and also FOS where grades come back in the form of numbers and there's a confusion with number to letter conversion. We didn't give enough moments along the way how numbers translate into numbers. Might produce anxiety. Moving forward, in courses where it's appropriate, will try to have subgrading come out in numbers, letting students know what that translates into. We'll be talking to faculty about this in end of sem workshops.

Sanger: We thought a lot about differential grading and how that affects honours. We came up with different proposals but some were impractical because of the small class sizes and the difficulty of controlling for human error. We even considered a really complicated system to take into account what the average grade was for each module and factor that into the calculation (for honours). Created a lot of room for human error and a lot of mathematical mumbo jumbo that mathematicians felt was unfeasible. We came up with strategy of letting honours be honours and grading be grading. Smoothing of grading will be a separate thing. That's where **retroactive S/U option for Class of 2017** came from.

Regina: Can I check when the FAQ will be released?

EVP: We have a document. Tidying up to the doc, will add more or two items, will check with CIPE if they're comfortable with disclosing. So maybe early next week.

Regina: Will send minutes to all in meeting for checking before it's published.

Regina: More suggestions for the FAQ, from feedback that students gave in feedback form. It seems students weren't aware of some things, might be worth clarifying. Some students didn't know everyone is getting honours. Question of bell-curving, some submissions assumed that every class was bell-curved in Yale-NUS already. (EVP: We don't.) Should just clarify our bell-curving policy.