

Academic Regulations Committee

April 19, 2017

Minutes

Voting members present: Nancy Barbour, Rosemary Garagnani, Rebecca Mathern, Dave Wing

Guests: John Bailey - Executive Committee, Esther Henry - General Council Office, Jesse Nelson - Undergraduate Studies and Academic Integrity Committee

Agenda: AR 15

Rebecca explained there were still concerns from faculty around not putting the procedures in the AR (this originally came up in the Faculty Feedback responses to the presentation of the draft in the Feb. 9, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting). Student conduct maintains the AMR (Academic Misconduct Report, which is the updated version of the Academic Dishonesty Reporting Form (ADRF)).

Nancy researched the Misconduct procedures/policies from U of O (had a handout for us to view).

Esther explained some concerns around procedures (from on behalf of the General Council Office (GCO)): the U of O structure allows for faculty to be questioned and so it subjects faculty to vulnerability, as is with the current AR15 (before any revisions/drafts), and so would like to be careful of adopting any of the U of O structure.

Jesse explained how the Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) discussed how much control does or should faculty have on the sanctions. This is what led to the proposed model (where CHO adjudicates). He also noted that there is an educational opportunity in this process (whatever it may be) and we don't want to take that away in any revision of our policy and procedures.

We discussed the proposed revision draft - changes were mainly a matter of wordsmithing to help clarification. After these changes, we agreed that it seemed like a good draft. We (the ARC) will vote via email and John will bring it to the EC for review, send out to FS via email to review, then for vote at the next FS meeting in May.

[EDIT: Vote by email for the ARC on 4-19-17, unanimously agreeing to the proposed revisions].