2013-14 FACULTY SENATE
ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MINUTES

Approved: November 1, 2013

October 18, 2013

Members Present: Blumberg, Irwin, Raskauskas, Schmidtlein, L. Taylor, Anderegg, Diaz, Evans, Malroutu, D. Taylor, Trigales, Slabinski, Hernandez,

Members Absent: Bradley, Escobar, Gonsier-Gerdin, Migliaccio, Markovic, Van Gaasbeck (on leave, Fall 2013)

Guests: Bill Dillon, Joel Schwartz

1. **Call to Order**: Called to order at 2:05 p.m.

2. **Open Forum:** Concern was expressed about letters received by some faculty and staff members about personal security breaches, as well as the lack of lead time in communications about the Provost candidate visits and meetings. Concern was also expressed about the lack of a recording device at the meeting.

3. **Agenda Approved**: 2:10p

4. **Amended Minutes Oct 4, 2013 Approved:** 2:15p

5. **Revocation of Degree Policy:** L. Taylor reported on the conversation of the revocation of degree policy work group. Discussion on the policy followed the structure of that task force report to the committee (authored by Escobar).

    - Committee accepted the structural revision proposed by the task force wherein policy and procedural language were isolated.
    - Committee discussed at length the proposed changes in the circumstances in which degree revocation could be considered. Committee agreed in principle that these should be restricted to the circumstances identified in L. Taylor's version of the task force's proposed language (specifically, removing possibility of degree revocation as a result of clerical error on the part of the university), but may be interested in word smithing in the future.
    - It was suggested that language should be added at the end of the policy section to indicate that degree revocation can only occur if the specified procedures are followed.

- Committee agreed that the academic honesty policy should be amended as recommended by the task force.
- Committee discussed whether or not there should be some time after which a degree cannot be revoked. Opinion was divided. Some felt that there may be cases so substantial that they would warrant degree revocation regardless of time elapsed. Others felt that limiting revocation beyond a certain time would protect accused degree holders from action if there was insufficient evidence for their defense as a result of changes in staffing, memory, etc. A motion was made to remove the time language from the policy, and it carried with 3 yeas and 1 abstention.
- It was agreed that the procedure language should be amended to remove the possibility of revoking honors for a degree independent of the revocation of the degree.
- The meeting concluding with the discussion on the role of faculty involvement. The committee felt that faculty should be involved in the degree revocation process. The question that remains to be resolved is in what way. It was suggested that the policy could be modified so that the president's authority to revoke a degree was limited to cases in which he received the consent of the faculty senate, but neither this point, nor how/where it could be expressed in the policy, were decided prior to the adjournment.

6. **Meeting Schedule for Spring 2013**

~~September 6~~	~~October 18~~	December 6
~~September 20~~	November 1	
~~October 4~~	November 15	

7. **Adjournment**: Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:40 pm.

_____

Matt Schmidtlein, Committee Vice Chair