

**Approved**  
**Minutes of the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate**  
**8-29-11**  
**KU 207**

**Present:** Paul Benson, Jim Dunne, Vinod Jain, Laura Leming, Leno Pedrotti, Carolyn Phelps, John White, Deb Bickford

**Excused:** Tony Saliba

**Absent:** Joe Castellano

**Minutes approved:** Minutes of the 3-28-11 meeting were approved.

**Old Business:**

*1) Cap Competencies Committee – process for reporting*

The question had been sent to ECAS regarding the reporting process of the CAP Competency Committee – did the Committee report to ECAS directly or to the APC? ECAS was of the opinion that the Committee would report to APC. APC concurred with this. Monthly reports will be made to the APC by the CAP Competencies Committee.

*2) Cap Competencies Committee – voting privileges*

The faculty and student members of the CAP committee unanimously interpreted this to mean that only the nine faculty and student members are voting members of the committee. This decision was sent to ECAS for approval. ECAS responded by stating that the voting structure should parallel the Gen Ed Committee with ex officio members voting. However due to the larger proportion of ex officio members on the CAP committee, ECAS recommended: Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program, Associate Dean of the College Arts and Sciences; and the Registrar or designate should have a vote; however, Deans or designates should not. This was sent to APC for discussion and recommendation.

Discussion ensued regarding voting privileges for deans or dean designates. Benson stated that the Committee will essential have the same authority currently held by the General Education Committee and thus some administrators should be voting members. Pedrotti, who is also a member of the CAP Competencies Committee, clarified that initially the faculty and student members of the CAP committee voted unanimously to support the interpretation of the Senate document to mean that only those nine members are voting members of the committee. However, once this “parallel” structure to the General Education Committee was discussed by the CAP Competencies Committee, they supported a voting structure in which the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program, Associate Dean of the College Arts and Sciences and the Registrar would receive votes in addition to the nine faculty and student members would votes. Dunne pointed out that a similar voting structure for two committees is not required by the Senate document. Leming pointed out that if all members have a vote, more votes would be held by administrators. Benson said that we do not want ex officio members to overwhelm the vote. A better weighting would be for those specifically named ex officio members ( i.e., Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program, Associate Dean of the College Arts and Sciences; and the Registrar) to be voting members; administration would be represented but would not overwhelm the Committee. White pointed out that including the deans (or designates) may encourage more involvement

from the professional schools. Dunne indicated that role of this committee is curriculum oversight thus the vote should remain with the faculty. Pedrotti favored either inclusion of all ex officio members or exclusion of all ex officio members. This idea was also supported by Tony Saliba (absent) in an email received by and read at the meeting by Phelps (APC chair). Jain pointed out that since the deans are responsible for implementation of the curriculum, they (or their designates) should have a vote. There was then discussion about lack of clarity in the Senate document ; it states that “Each undergraduate dean has the option to serve or to appoint a designate as an ex officio member in addition to the ex officio members identified above.” Therefore, it was not clear whether a deans or designates were required to be members of the committee. Discussion returned to the voting structure of the General Education Committee. The point was made that the voting structure of the GE Committee is functioning well, thus there is not clear impetus to change it. The question was raised regarding the message sent if deans do not receive a vote and whether they would vote with their faculty since they do not have a direct vote. Bickford stated that she is an ex officio non-voting member on several committees and, as such, does not feel like a second class citizen. A vote was called and the APC voted. Six of the seven voting members supported the voting structure in which the 9 faculty and student members and three ex officio members - Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program, Associate Dean of the College Arts and Sciences, and the Registrar—receive a vote. It should be noted that the chair neglected to formally call the motion prior to calling the vote. This recommendation will be sent back to ECAS.

### *3) Academic Misconduct Policy*

ECAS returned the form to APC with recommended changes including: deletion of student ID number, inclusion of appeal information and deadlines, change of the word “Dishonesty” to “Misconduct”. There was discussion regarding why the student ID should not be included. This needs to be followed with ECAS. It was suggested that minor formatting changes be made so that it is not implied that Social Security numbers are requested. The form will also be changed to reflect that the completed form is given to the “Dean of the student’s college or school”.

Discussion then began about many of the larger issues regarding the Misconduct policy, including: inclusion of a who “needs to know” clause about violations; where information regarding violations will be kept; whether there should be uniform penalties for misconduct; whether this new form/process will help address the repeat offender issue; whether this form will increase reporting; whether this conforms with the Honor Policy; whether this form will make a difference.

It was decided that, since the development of the Academic Misconduct form was initiated by student concerns regarding repeat offenders, SAPC should be consulted. SAPC should also provide input to the process and the issues listed above.

Phelps reminded the APC of remaining old business and indicated that the September meeting would focus on the Program Proposal Document.

Meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Carolyn Roecker Phelps